National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION AS A VEHICLE FOR TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BY

LORRAINE MICHELE RINGROSE ©

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1996

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-10792-2

Canadä

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: **LORRAINE MICHELE RINGROSE**

TITLE OF THESIS: **COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION AS A VEHICLE FOR TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

DEGREE: **MASTER OF EDUCATION**

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: **1996**

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

LRingrose
(Student's signature)
PERMANENT ADDRESS:
14504-78 Ave.
Edmonton, Alberta
T5R 3C5

Date: April 18, 1996

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled, "COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION AS A VEHICLE FOR TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT" submitted by LORRAINE MICHELE RINGROSE in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters in Education.

Dr. J.L. da Costa, Supervisor

Dr. F. Peters

KJ Willson

Dr. K. Willson

Date: April 15, 1996

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study was designed to address how teachers perceived the process of collaborative supervision as a vehicle for their professional development. The main question was: Do teachers perceive themselves as willing to take risks and to try innovative teaching strategies when they engage in the process of collaborative supervision.

The respondents for this study were eight elementary teachers from Keywest school, in a large urban Alberta school district. All of the respondents volunteered to participate after they had attended an information session on collaborative supervision. The participants all agreed to work with partners in a minimum of two "rounds" of the collaborative supervision process. Following the second round of collaborative supervision, each teacher was interviewed using a semi-structured approach.

Both inductive and deductive processes were used to thematically analyze the interviews. The veracity of the initial findings was tested by sharing them with the participants and requesting feedback.

Several findings presented themselves, as a result of participating in collaborative supervision:

1. The development of work focused, collegial relationships is promoted.

2. Teachers saw value in the process as a professional development tool.

3. Feelings of isolation were reduced in teachers.

4. Teachers felt supported by their administrators.

5. The process is very time consuming.

6. Teachers tended to take risks and implement changes in their classrooms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A sincere thank you to the many people who assisted me in completing this thesis.

A special thanks to Dr. Joe da Costa for the guidance and encouragement he provided me, as well as the members of my examination committee; Dr. F. Peters and Dr. K. Willson.

I would like to acknowledge the teachers who participated in this study. Without their support, this study could not have been completed. As well, I would like to thanks my school administrator for all her flexibility and the encouragement she provided for the CS project in the school.

Most importantly, I would like to say a very big thanks to my husband Doug and to my three sons, Michael, Mark and Sean. These four very important men in my life have all been very patient and accommodating over the last year. Their assistance with the day to day events in our busy family enabled me to focus on my work, and to meet many deadlines. Without their caring, cooperation and support, this thesis could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

1. The Problem 1

Introduction 1

Statement of the problem 2

Significance of the study 5

Assumptions 6

Definitions of terms 6

Limitations and delimitations 8

Organization of thesis 9

2. Review of the Literature 10

Introduction 10

Differences between supervision and evaluation 10

Essentials for success 17

Problems inherent in teacher supervision 18

In support of collaboration 23

Proponents of collaborative models 26

Summary 28

3. Method 29

Research Design - The site and the participants 30

Data Collection 34

Data Analysis 36

Summary 37

4. Findings of the study 38

Introduction 38

Collegiality 39

Professional development 49

Teacher Isolation 60

Administrative support 62

Unanticipated Findings 67

Discussion of findings 70

Discussion of unanticipated findings 81

Risk taking and innovative teaching 83

Summary of findings 85

Summary of potential responses to the research questions and sub-questions 86

5. Conclusions and recommendations 89

Nature of the study 89

Method used 90

Conclusions 91

Recommendations 96

Recommendations for practice 96

Recommendations for theory 99

Closing comments 100

References 102

Appendix A - Information session 108

Appendix B - Consent form 109

Appendix C - Interview questions 110

Appendix D - Sample interview 111

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The continent of North America is in transition with the educational reform movement. Everywhere educators are searching for ways to improve schools, and the effectiveness of educational personnel. At the heart of many of the changes is the belief that it is necessary to have excellent performance on the part of teachers (Barth, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992).

A look at the current literature offers support for the idea that a collaborative supervision (CS) model can be used successfully to assist teachers in acquiring strategies that, when implemented in the classroom, can improve instruction and learning. Both Glickman (1989) and Little (1982) looked at what were considered to be "successful" schools, and they determined that one attribute shared by these schools was the "on-going instructional dialogue" amongst the teachers. Little (1982) discussed how the culture in these schools encouraged teachers to practise collegiality and work towards continuous improvement.

Collaboration offers teachers the opportunity to have an alternative style of supervision, one that is interactive, democratic and teacher centered. The intent of this study is to acquire insights regarding the potential for CS to offer an alternate avenue for teacher professional development in today's schools.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to explore teacher perceptions of the process of CS, and its perceived effects on teaching practice.

I sought answers to the question: " Do teachers perceive themselves as willing to take risks and to try innovative teaching strategies when they engage in a collaborative supervision process?" Through the investigation of this question, several sub-questions were also addressed, namely:

1. Can the collaborative supervision process help to develop feelings of collegiality amongst teachers?
2. Can the collaborative supervision process help to reduce feelings of isolation among teachers?
3. What is the perceived effect of administrative support on the collaborative supervision process?
4. What value do teachers perceive the collaborative supervision process to have for their professional development?

Paralleling these four sub-questions are four biases held by me. The purpose for addressing these is two-fold. First, this discussion will help the reader to better assess potential weaknesses in the research design. Second, I attempted to overcome the effects of these biases by including precautionary steps in the data collection and analysis phases of the study. These precautionary steps taken to enhance the study's validity are described in detail in chapter 3.

Teachers can develop strong feelings of collegiality, based on respect and support of one another in the teaching process. I believe this to be the case because of my own experiences with the process of CS. This experience occurred with a teaching partner whom I trusted and who had a similar teaching style and philosophy to my own. As we progressed through the subsequent cycles of collaborative supervision, we became more and more comfortable discussing teaching experiences. We also became more comfortable entering into problem solving discussions about difficulties we were having with our classes. I believe that as we worked together longer we became much more collegial than we had been previously. This perspective is supported by Darling-Hammond (1992) and Dillon-Peterson (1986) and will be addressed further in the review of the literature.

Teachers can feel less isolated if they feel that they have someone to share problems and concerns with, as long as they are free of the threat of evaluation. I believe that when teachers develop rapport with another person on staff, they have someone to "turn to" to discuss concerns and problems that they might not otherwise share - particularly with the administration. CS gives them an opportunity to meet with other teachers in other classrooms, which they might not otherwise have the opportunity to do. CS also allows teachers to share concerns with someone with whom they can be totally honest, without the fear of evaluation. My own experience, which is supported by Smyth (1988), has shown me that regardless of how hard school administration try to make teachers comfortable before classroom visits, teachers still experience feelings of apprehension.

Administrators can help teachers to feel that the CS process will be facilitated by the administration by offering the teachers both emotional and financial support for the program. My own experience suggests that the process of collaboration takes considerable time, a commodity which teachers have very little to spare during the school day. If teachers are released from their classes to be able to participate in CS, they will be more willing to engage in the process. Teachers will be more willing to put in the amount of time that is necessary to reflect on their teaching and subsequently implement changes in their classrooms. This perspective is supported by Sergiovanni (1992) and Glickman (1995).

Teachers can appreciate the value of CS as a process that is valuable for their professional growth. I believe that with decreased amounts of funding available for professional development, CS is a cost effective means for enhancing professional development by having teachers learning from other teachers in schools. Teachers should be treated as experts in their own field, and they should be encouraged to share their accumulated knowledge with each other (Smyth, 1988; Goldhammer, 1993).

Significance of the Study

This research is practically significant because it investigated the CS model as a vehicle for teacher development. If teachers are offered the opportunity to spend time working with each other, they can share ideas and implement new strategies in their classrooms. A collegial climate in schools works to ensure a strong commitment to teacher growth, which, ultimately, may result in higher student achievement (Acheson & Gall, 1992). Further practical significance lies in the suggestions offered to provide administrators for promoting collaboration and collegiality within schools.

This study is also theoretically significant because the data gathered will enable me to extend the literature in a way that takes into account the perspectives of a few Alberta teachers.

Assumptions

Two assumptions are made in this study. First, that school administrators hold a key role in influencing school culture. This culture affects teachers' willingness to participate in projects such as CS. It is also assumed that the teachers who were interviewed felt comfortable enough to be open and honest in expressing their feelings and perceptions regarding their professional development and the CS process.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions are used:

1. Collaborative supervision: a regular systemic consultative process between two or more colleagues for the purpose of reflecting on teaching practice in an effort to grow

professionally. This process differs from evaluation in that the process is teacher directed, and the choice of whether or not to implement any changes in teaching practice remains the prerogative of the teacher. The focus is on professional growth and not on a deficit model of teaching. An evaluation is not made about whether the teacher is a "success" or a "failure." Instead the focus is on "What I can do to improve this situation?" and it is asked from within a secure, collegial relationship rather than from within an expert-subordinate relationship.

2. Administrative support: any positive recognition of achievement, either psychological or material, given to a teacher by an administrator. Material support could include information dispersal, resources, or provision of time for teachers.

3. Collegiality: When teachers work together, are familiar with one another's work, share ideas about teaching practice and help each other. When teachers are behaving collegially, the focus of their work is on teacher growth. Collegiality differs from congeniality in that the latter is characterized by loyalty, trust and easy conversation (Sergiovanni, 1992). The focus may or may not be on teacher growth. In a collegial situation, the goal is focused on self-improvement.

4. Professional Development: This is an on-going process in which teachers participate with the goals of wanting to learn, to change and to grow (Haughey et al., 1993). The goal of their growth is to make instruction in the classroom better.

5. Innovative teaching strategies: Any teaching approach that teachers had not previously used.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study has limited generalizability because of its reliance on a volunteer, purposive sampling technique. However, it can be argued that much of what was found from this group of volunteers is transferable to a population exhibiting the same characteristics and context as the sample. Generalizations to teachers at levels other than elementary may not be valid. As well, the time of year that this study was conducted may have had an impact on the results due to the respondents' immediate experiences or faded memories of past events. The beginning of the school year, as well as the reporting periods are "peak times" when there is an extreme demand on teaching time.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter 1 served to introduce the problem, the purpose and the significance of this study. As well, basic assumptions, limitations and delimitations of this study are presented. In Chapter 2, a synthesis of the current research on teacher supervision, collaboration and collaborative supervision models is provided. Chapter 3 outlines the method, research procedures, and data collection techniques used in this study. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the interview data and a discussion of the findings, in light of the literature, which emerged from the analysis. As well, tentative responses to the research sub-questions and the general question are presented. The final chapter, Chapter 5, includes a summary of the study, conclusion and recommendations, as well as implications for practice and future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will examine the CS literature from the perspective that it be used as a vehicle for teacher professional development. The literature related to teacher supervision with the intent of teacher growth will be examined. As well, teacher collaboration and collaborative supervision models are investigated. This study will explore the literature to determine what influence CS has on the professional growth and development of teachers.

I will begin examining the differences between supervision and evaluation models, both traditional and current. This discussion is followed by an examination of: (a) problems inherent in supervision, (b) support for collaboration and (c) proponents of a collaborative model. The chapter concludes with a summary of the literature.

Differences Between Supervision and Evaluation

The literature itself often fails to make a clear distinction between supervision and evaluation, but for the purpose of this study, supervision will refer to educators working together towards the goal of professional development. Evaluation would refer to a judgement being made on the performance of a teacher for the purpose of recognizing competence or for promotion, tenure or extending contracts. The role of the evaluator is not one of a facilitator, as in CS (Acheson & Gall, 1992).

Collaborative Supervision Model

The CS model allows teachers to work with teaching partners to reduce the discrepancy between the actual teaching behavior and what they perceive as the ideal teaching behavior (Acheson & Gall, 1992). Its roots lie with earlier models of clinical supervision touted by Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969). Glickman's (1990) developmental supervision suggested using one of the following approaches, a : (a) directive approach where the supervisor rather than the teacher directed the process, (b) collaborative approach whereby both parties have relatively more input, or (c) non-directive approach where the teacher rather than the supervisor directs the situation. He believed that all were acceptable as long as the goal was to ultimately empower the teacher in his or her teaching.

Teachers as Professionals

CS is an approach that is consultative, where comments or observations can be requested by the teacher being observed or offered by the teaching partner. CS should be primarily teacher directed, and it should reflect the aspirations and the concerns of the teacher (Smyth, 1991). This may be difficult for some administrators, and it may be even more difficult for teachers who are aware that administrators are also responsible for their evaluation at the district level. The teaching partners must be seen as professionals, working to encourage reflection on the teaching process, allowing the teacher to be in control. Final decisions of whether or not to implement suggested changes remain the judgement of the teacher (Waite, 1995).

Garman (1990), Darling-Hammond (1992), Grimmett et al. (1992), Little (1987) and Zumwalt (1986) have all suggested that teachers are more likely to experience professional growth through a collegial relationship, rather than through administrator-teacher relationships. Teachers may not be as trusting or open with evaluators as they would be with colleagues who are not responsible for evaluation of teaching. Gitlin and Smyth (1989) suggested that there should never be any attempt by a colleague to question the authority, competence or the self-worth of a teaching partner. This would only serve to undermine their relationship that is based on trust of each other as colleagues and professionals. All attempts must be made to help partners raise their consciousness regarding teaching. He further stated that expertise in teaching does not lie solely with the educators who have left the classroom, and that expertise is not hierarchical. Teachers are professionals who have considerable expertise themselves.

Reflection

Reflection should occur between the partners during the process of CS. Schon (1983) discussed reflection as a process of thinking about personal experiences, comparing and analyzing them based on past experiences, then implementing new scenarios, again evaluating them by comparing to past experience. Garman (1990) described reflection as being thoughtful about an issue, based on new information, then planning what to do and what to change. Reflection includes thinking about past experience, developing a course of action, implementing the plan and evaluating it critically. It is an appraisal of the outcomes of one's work. This, when compared to thoughtfulness, implies more action taken on the process. Thoughtfulness does not draw on past experience. In reflection, changes may be implemented, not only "thought about."

Gitlin and Smyth (1989) believed that an outcome of reflecting with a teaching partner is the mutual encouragement and support that the teachers experience from the relationship. He also suggested that groups of teaching partners should dialogue about the process of CS and work to build professional support groups.

Dillon-Peterson (1986) presented the thought that teachers need to use CS to reflect, to focus and plan with people, and that administrators need to provide for financial and time resource support.

Teachers' behaviors will change when they are practised and self-critiqued in the classroom, and reapplied to other real classroom situations. Bang-Jensen (1986) agreed that acquiring new skills or attitudes requires trial and error, which happens over a period of time. The initiatives for growth should come from the reflection process. She added that teachers can learn much from teaching situations where they have not been successful. If teachers have the freedom to take risks, they may attempt to design lessons to try to produce different outcomes.

Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1995) discussed how in a CS process, teachers exhibit more collaborative behaviors such as clarifying, listening, reflecting, and problem solving. These skills help teachers to evaluate new situations based on past experiences. Gitlin (1989) talked about how in collaborative consultation, teachers make an effort to dialogue, analyze, deconstruct and reformulate their teaching in ways that are very practical to them.

Teachers begin to ask questions and to work together to find the answers. CS also allows teachers to better understand themselves, making them more able to dialogue with parents, students, and others about what they do in the classroom and why they do it. Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1993) felt that the CS model allowed mutual exploration by the partners and provided many opportunities to discuss alternatives. It also provides opportunities for the building of teachers' self-concept through the use of peer praise and encouragement.

Steps in Collaborative Supervision

Collaborative Supervision consists of three main parts: (a) pre-observation conference, (b) classroom observation and (c) post-conference. Each of these is elaborated on below.

Pre-observation conference.

The pre-observation conference, hereafter called the pre-conference, allows the teaching partners the opportunity to decide what will be observed, how data will be collected for the observation, and when the observation will occur. Often at this stage, teachers express a concern or state an area of growth they would like to address. This process also helps to establish a feeling of trust and respect amongst the teaching partners as there is an element of risk in discussing concerns about an individual's teaching practice. Acceptable guidelines are established in an effort to lay out the format for the observation. (Acheson & Gall,1992; Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski,1993).

Classroom observation. It is during the classroom observation that data are collected by the teaching partner. During observations, the partners test the reality of their own perceptions about the teaching process (Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski, 1993). Several techniques are suggested for data collection, these include: (a) observational records, (b) selective verbatim techniques, (c) wide-lens techniques, and (d) checklists and charts (Acheson & Gall, 1992).

It is important that the data collected be only what was agreed to by the teacher and teaching partner during the pre-conference, and in as objective a manner as possible. The rapport between the teachers must be nurtured, and partners should never risk losing rapport for the sake of any personal objectives. If teaching partners add personal judgements regarding observations, the rapport already established between partners will suffer (Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski, 1993). This is essential to ensure that the data collected are relevant for the teacher (Acheson & Gall, 1992).

Post-observation conference. This is the culmination of the CS process. During this time, teachers review and analyse the data collected to make sense of what has occurred during the observation.

It is necessary to avoid making a list of faults regarding what occurred during the observation (Acheson & Gall, 1992). Teaching partners should reflect on the data and offer comments or suggestions which are supported by the data. Then using the information acquired, teaching partners can discuss what changes they would like to implement as a result of what has been learned and what should be maintained. Reflection occurs regarding the teaching; comparing new knowledge to past experiences, and planning changes in future teaching. Through the process of collaborative supervision, teaching partners hypothesize about how planned changes may affect their classroom instruction.

Essentials for Success

Following these CS techniques alone does ensure success. Smyth (1986) suggested that it is essential that CS be entered into on a voluntary basis, and that the process be clearly understood by all parties from the beginning. He suggested that a thorough orientation about the goals, processes and procedures of CS be provided for all participants by a knowledgeable party. As well, he suggested that on-site support of leadership staff should be in place. Administration should be prepared to offer resources (e.g.

time), encouragement and recognition for teachers to participate in CS (Goldhammer et al, 1993; Louks-Horsley, 1987).

Problems Inherent in Teacher Supervision

Lack of Skilled Supervisors

Many current experiences of teachers leave them with the opinion that supervision leaves much to be desired. Concerns range from supervision being too infrequent to supervisors being ill-equiped to supervise (Rymhs, Allston & Schulz, 1993). Some teachers feel that the supervisors can demonstrate an observer bias and be closed to accepting ideas other than their own. It is also suggested that principals are often unable to distinguish between effective and ineffective instruction (Rymhs, Allston & Schulz, 1993). Schonberger (1986) discussed how most supervisors are quick to point out deficiencies in teaching, but have little in the way of ideas to contribute to remedy the situation. McKeachie (1987) suggested that supervision has the potential of being less than what the teachers expected. If feedback is not specific in nature, teachers may experience a hopelessness and feel little motivation to change. If teachers have had little positive reinforcement about their prior accomplishments they have little on which to base their goals for future growth.

Expert-Subordinate Relationship

Schonberger (1986) stated that in a principal-teacher relationship, the teacher often feels subservient to the principal, who is supposed to be the “expert”. This relationship produces feelings of dependence, insecurity and powerlessness on the part of the teachers. Further supervision sessions are looked at with suspicion by teachers; teachers suspect hidden agendas on the part of the supervisors. Nolan and Francis (1992) stated that when the supervisor is viewed as a critic who is in charge of making judgements about the teacher’s performance, the supervision process remains at a surface level. Deeper issues are not discussed because of the lack of a trusting relationship. Teachers will not share their “true” problems with someone whom they are not comfortable; issues that could be addressed in a trusting relationship are not accessible to the pair. Overall, it would seem that the directive style of supervision used by principals poses a threat to teachers and does little else other than to undermine their confidence (Acheson & Gall, 1992). Goldsberry (1984) felt that the status of supervisors can drastically inhibit the ability of teachers to dialogue in a collegial manner, especially if the supervisors are also involved in teacher evaluation. Lortie (1975) suggested that teachers tolerate the evaluation as a necessary evil that is part of the administrative bureaucracy, but that teachers: (a) look to their students' performance as indicators of their teaching performance, and (b) base their attempts to change on these results. Glickman (1993) stated that principals and teachers are far more comfortable discussing just about any topic other than a pedagogical issue. When discussions centre around curriculum, teaching strategies, staff development and learning, teachers often question and analyze the discussion fearing that they are being tested or judged on their opinions and comments.

Protection of Autonomy by Teachers

Johnson (1990) discussed how teachers feel very strongly about their autonomy in their teaching and, therefore, value and protect their privacy. They fear being placed in competitive situations where they may be subjected to criticism. As a result, teachers may discourage open exchange when the subject is pedagogical in nature. These feelings may even prevent teachers from participating in activities that would promote collaboration and growth. Teachers need to overcome their fears and take charge of their own professional development in an effort to help alleviate the feelings of isolation in teaching (Johnson, 1990).

Organization of Schools

Schools are most often set up in a manner that maintains classroom isolation rather than fostering collaborative processes. Sergiovanni (1992) suggested that scheduling and location of classrooms are organized in a way that is not conducive to teachers working collaboratively with each other (e.g. when one teacher has preparation time, most other teachers in the school are teaching and, consequently, are not available for consultations. Schools do not seem to be able to allocate time in schedules for "teaching talk" to occur, let alone for teachers to work on curriculum development or on collaborative supervision activities (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 1995).

History of Ineffectiveness

Rymhs, Allston and Schulz (1993) stated that the traditional mode of evaluation has not been very successful in changing teachers' behaviors, since most emphasize evaluation rather than teacher growth. Goldhammer (1969) felt that supervision needed to be freed from its origin as a tool for watching over teachers to ensure that they were doing what supervisors wanted them to do. Smyth (1988) and Garman (1990) have documented how over the last 30 years, even though some supervisors may have presented it otherwise, the process of supervision has become a way of inspecting teachers and monitoring their delivery of instruction. This history of the ineffectiveness of evaluation may explain some of the apprehension and mistrust felt by teachers when they are involved with an administrator in the process of supervision.

Competition

The Joint Committee for Standards for Education Evaluation in California (JCSEEC)(1988) suggested that many current supervision practices; (a) fail to provide good feedback, (b) fail to recognize outstanding service and (c) don't unify teachers in schools; instead these current supervision practices tend to divide teachers by supporting a competitive atmosphere among them. Sergiovanni (1992) suggested that administrators often talk about the value of a collegial atmosphere in a school but that their actions often fail to support their words. They frequently end up encouraging competition amongst staff rather than recognizing and applauding cooperation.

Recognizing Effective Teaching

The JCSEEC (1988) also suggested that there is a lack of consensus about what good performance is in relation to teaching

(Kauchak, Peterson & Driscoll, 1985). Supervisors tend to look at personal characteristics of teachers rather than on their teaching performance or effectiveness.

Summary

Teachers feel that supervision is plagued with problems such as the; (a) lack of skilled supervisors, (b) inhibition of teachers in an expert-subordinate relationship, (c) protection of autonomy by teachers, (d) organization of school and schedules, (e) history of ineffectiveness of teacher supervision, (f) dividing teachers in a competitive atmosphere and (g) inability to recognize effective teaching. It would seem that as educators, we must attempt some reform if our goal of teacher supervision is for teachers professional growth.

In Support of Collaboration

Meeting Teachers' Needs

Teachers know that different students have different learning styles and that it is impossible to effectively teach all students if only one teaching style is used. Individual needs play an important part in the planning process to facilitate student learning (e.g., Dunn & Griggs, 1995; Tomlinson, 1995; Stallings, 1994). Administrators expect teachers to meet the needs of their students, so they need to ensure that teachers have the necessary skills to be able to meet students' needs. Sergiovanni (1987) stated that teachers vary in their goals of teaching, as well as their learning styles, and therefore supervisors should have a strong repertoire of techniques to be able to vary the way they supervise. The JCSEE (1988) suggested that in order for supervision to be free of threat and demoralization, the process should be established with teacher consultation; it should be based on individual teacher's needs, interests and responsibilities. Using a variety of approaches in different situations often proves to be more successful.

Teacher Collaboration

Little (1982) stressed that just as students benefit from cooperating in groups, so do teachers. When teachers are allowed to work together to help each other learn and refine their teaching, they have opportunities to make gains in professional development. Nolan and Francis (1992) suggested that working together in a consultative process allows teachers to generate new knowledge about teaching. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1995) stated that teachers need to engage in frequent concrete and precise discussions in an effort to teach each other about teaching practice. Their learning should be related to their own experiences, needs and strengths. Allowing time for analysis and critical thinking about teaching allows teachers to become more empowered. As teacher choice and control increases, instructional improvement can occur. With increased teacher empowerment would come a strong commitment to self improvement. Glickman (1993) suggested that schools need to become more collegial, where purposeful discussions about teaching and learning can occur in an atmosphere of mutual professional respect. Further to this, Louks-Horsley (1987) felt that successful professional development programs include collegiality and collaboration, where experimentation and risk-taking are involved. In a collegial and collaborative setting, participants do their own goal setting and implement their own decisions. Zumwalt (1986) further supported this and stated that most teachers are active, reflective professionals concerned about the growth of their students as well as themselves. Teachers will involve themselves in professional deliberation and problem solving if given opportunities. Rymhs, Allston and Schulz (1993), Gitlin and Price (1992) and Glatthorn (1990) recommended establishing collegial relationships that are based on trust. Through collaborative efforts, teachers can work with other teachers, establishing criteria and ensuring that they are clear as to what the criteria mean. Sandell and Sullivan (1992) discussed how teachers want to work with people who are effective in providing good feedback and who can support their ideas. They also felt that it is very beneficial for teaching partners to be able to work together as equals rather than in an expert-subordinate relationship.

Administrative Support

Haughey, et al. (1993) found that teachers perceived themselves as more apt to experience growth in a professional development context than in a formal evaluation context. More growth is experienced when teachers work with other teachers than when they are directed by administrators. Teacher collaboration is facilitated when principals use their leadership skills to encourage the formation of a culture of learning within schools, and when they treat teachers as experts in their own fields. Haughey, et al. (1993) recommend that schools implement school based initiatives that encourage and sustain professional growth. School administrators should encourage collaboration by adjusting timetables to facilitate the process and by engaging teachers in discussions about teaching and learning. Sergiovanni (1992) further stated that teachers need to be given sufficient time to meet and to interact.

Proponents of Collaborative Models

Many researchers seem to be proponents of some form of a collegial, collaborative, or clinical supervision model (e.g., Acheson & Gall, 1992; Glickman, 1990; Little, 1987). The reasons expressed seem to be consistent. CS is a process that stresses self development which is undertaken with an empathetic and supportive colleague. This seems to be most likely to occur between teachers and their teaching partners when the level of trust is high and hidden agendas are not an issue. McKeachie (1987) suggested that collaborative supervision allows for much higher levels of cognition on the part of the teacher. Criterion referenced evaluation does not allow teachers to conceptualize their roles and encourage the reflective process that is so necessary to allow true change in learning to occur. Smyth (1986, 1991) felt that this process empowers teachers to share insights rather than having one person try to “fix” another person’s teaching. CS puts the control of the teaching situation in the hands of the teachers, for it is they who decide what is examined. Existing teaching practices may be challenged and replaced by possible alternative strategies. The teaching partner becomes like a mirror, a companion for the teacher headed in a direction that he or she selects. Glickman (1990) supported the idea, stating that teacher choice of goals and activities is essential. It must be teacher self-initiated and self-directed. Zumwalt (1986) believed that teachers will chose experiences that will be rewarding to them professionally. Collaborative models enable teachers to attempt innovations in their instruction that they would probably not otherwise try. The teachers shape the shared task and jointly analyze its outcomes. Charles (1987) suggested that teaching is an art enhanced by science; he goes on to state that a holistic process for examining teaching more holistically is essential.

Summary

If the aim of professional teachers is to improve their teaching, then opportunities have to be provided for teachers to take control of their professional development. The literature indicates that collaboration and collegial interaction allow teachers more autonomy and control. CS offers an alternative for teachers' professional growth other than principals jointly supervising and evaluating teachers, which may lead to suspicion and role conflict. Teachers can work with colleagues, providing their teaching partners with "equal" partners with whom a trusting relationship can be built. Teachers and teaching partners can engage in reflection, are free to take risks, to build self-esteem and attempt alternative teaching strategies. Administrators can support the CS process by providing resources in the form of finances and time to teachers. Collaborative supervision is also seen as a means to alleviate some of the isolation felt by teachers in todays' schools.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The research method for this study was designed to attain understanding of how teachers view the process of collaborative supervision as a vehicle for their professional development. This chapter is divided into the following sections: (a) research design, (b) instrumentation, (c) population and sample, (d) data collection techniques, and (e) data analysis techniques.

The general question and sub-questions are restated here to serve as a reminder to the reader. The main question was : Do teachers perceive themselves as willing to take risks and to try innovative teaching strategies as a result of having participated in collaborative supervision? Related to this question were four sub-questions, namely:

1. Can collaborative supervision help to develop feelings of collegiality amongst teachers?
2. Can collaborative supervision help to reduce feelings of isolation amongst teachers?
3. What is the effect of administrative support on the collaborative supervision process?

4. Do teachers perceive that the collaborative supervision process has value for their professional development?

Research Design

The Site and the Participants

This study is best described as a qualitative study which made use of semi-structured interviews with collaborative supervision partners in an effort to seek their perceptions regarding the collaborative supervision process as a vehicle for professional development. As this is an interpretive approach, it must be understood that information given represents participants' points view. This viewpoint is based on the meaning that they give to their own personal experiences.

Description of the Site

Keywest school is a suburban elementary, dual track (French Immersion and English programming), school located in a large western Canadian city. The school enrolment is 357 students, with 80% of the population of students enrolled in the French Immersion program and the remainder enrolled in the English program. All students in the English program receive 30 minutes per day of instruction in French as a second language. This school's population comes primarily from a middle to high socio-economic area of the city.

Description of the Recruiting Technique

All of the teachers in the school were invited to attend an information session offered by Dr. J. da Costa and myself (see Appendix A). The information session introduced the teachers to the concept of CS, reviewed the related, current literature and provided them with written information regarding the process and procedures. Both Dr. da Costa and I were available to answer any questions that the teachers had. This session was held over a lunch hour at the teachers' request.

Description of the Participants

The respondents for this study were eight teachers, presently employed at the elementary school level, from Kindergarten to Grade six. A mix of six female and two male teachers expressed a willingness to participate in this study. These eight teachers were at various stages in their careers and professional development. In terms of their teaching experience, participants ranged from 3 years to 18 years. All teachers are "generalists" at the elementary level. The kindergarten teacher also has a diploma in Early Childhood Education. With the exception of one teacher who was employed on a part time basis, working one and one-half days per week, all teachers were employed on a full time basis. All participants hold Bachelor of Education degrees. Six of the eight teachers teach in the French Immersion program and are fluent in the French language. One of these six teachers has difficulty expressing himself in English, while the remaining five are fully bilingual in French and English. The two teachers who teach in the English program are unilingual in English, but supportive of the French Immersion program.

Description of Expectations of Participants During the Study

Teachers who attended the information session were asked to volunteer to be a part of this case study. They agreed to find a teaching partner or partners and to participate in a minimum of two rounds of the CS process. Each round consisted of a pre-observation conference, a classroom observation, and a post-observation conference for each teaching partner. Following the second round of CS, each teacher was to participate in an interview with me.

Description of Ethical Guidelines

All University of Alberta ethical guidelines were strictly adhered to. All participants were given the option to withdraw from this study at any time without fear of reprisal (see Appendix B). Copies of interview transcripts were provided to all participants. Pseudonyms were assigned to teachers for the purpose of the study.

Description of the School Role Played by the Principal Investigator

Since I am also the Curriculum Coordinator (Vice-Principal) at the school, a request was made by me not to be involved in any evaluation of teachers who were participating in the CS process. The school principal agreed to this request, and did not attend the information session as she did not want to influence anyone's decision as to whether or not to participate. She did, however, review the literature that was provided and asked questions of me regarding the process. She also offered her support for the program by personally commending staff who had volunteered to participate, as well as by offering to cover classes to release teachers during classroom observations and post-observation conferences. I also released teachers for this process.

Data Collection

The following paragraphs describe how the data were collected. The data collection was done on an on-going basis, from initial impressions recorded in my journal to the final interviews and follow-up questioning of teachers. As well, this section explains how my biases were addressed.

Description of the Interview Setting

The interviews occurred in my office at the school. This location was chosen because I knew that we would not be interrupted. My office has a desk, a table and two chairs, as well as bookshelves. At each interview, the teacher I was interviewing sat at the round table with me so that we could face each other as we talked. The tape recording machine was placed between both of us in an effort to get the best recording of our conversation.

Development and Administration of the Interview Schedule

The interview questions used in this study were semi-structured and based on my review of the literature related to teacher supervision and evaluation, collaboration, and clinical supervision. Questions were refined in consultation with my advisor (see Appendix C). Teachers were interviewed at the end of December, after they had completed two rounds of CS. Interviews lasted from

15 to 25 minutes. Additional questions emerged during the interview process; these were guided by the responses of the participants (see Appendix D). As well, further questions were posed to the participants after the initial interview to expand upon information already gathered. Notes were kept in a journal during the course of the study to record my perceptions and possible emerging themes.

Overcoming Biases

I made every effort to ensure that the data collected were meaningful, verifiable and taken from the "real life" experiences of the teachers. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed in full to ensure that all data were captured. Respondents were asked to read their transcripts and to reflect upon their comments. They were given the option of withdrawing or changing any of the data if they liked. Where necessary, follow up questions were conducted with the participants to supplement the information already gathered. After the transcripts were returned to the teachers, a couple of teachers expressed some concern over the language of the interview not being grammatically correct, and they indicated that they wanted to change the sentence structure. This did not change the substantive content of the transcripts, but did clarify the meaning being communicated.

Data Analysis

This section addresses the technique used for data analysis as well as attempts to overcome biases during the analysis stage. Each is addressed in turn below.

Description of Technique Used for Thematic Analysis

The data analysis was ongoing from the onset of this study. A personal journal was kept to record my impressions and thoughts throughout the course of the study. Journal entries were most numerous following the interviews and after follow-up questioning. Teachers each received a copy of their interview transcript and were provided the opportunity to review and edit it. I also met with teachers after I had completed the interviews to review my thoughts regarding what they had expressed. This was done in an effort to assure that the data I had collected were valid.

An inductive process was used initially to discover themes in the interview. Ideas that recurred from interview to interview emerged and lead me to develop themes. As I reviewed transcripts, other recurrences of ideas were noted. The transcripts were read many times in an effort to seek relevant information from the data. Data were coded using notes and color highlighting throughout the text. More ideas emerged during the categorizing of the transcripts. My journal was useful in helping to confirm ideas that were expressed. A deductive data coding process was also used to categorize some themes that had been identified in the literature review. The main research question and the sub-questions provided a logical structure to follow in the coding process. I then reviewed the interview data to see if some of these ideas addressed the sub-questions I had posed. Data that did not address the sub-questions were addressed as emergent themes. In the data analysis section, I provide quotes from the respondents to support statements made.

Summary

This interpretive study focused on eight teachers and their perceptions of how the CS process could be used as a vehicle for professional development. After attending an information session on CS, teachers participated in a minimum of two rounds of CS with a self-selected teaching partner. At the completion of their two rounds of CS, each teacher was interviewed by me using a semi-structured interview. Data were collected and recorded with a tape recorder to ensure no loss of data. The data analysis was done using both an inductive and deductive process. An analysis of the data led to the development of categories, of patterns, and ultimately, of themes. This information was shared with participating teachers as a confirmation of their perceptions. The findings are described in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the interview data gathered from the eight respondents in this study. The analysis is divided into five parts to correspond to the sub-questions asked in this study. The sub-questions provide a framework for organizing the data that emerged from the interviews. In addition, several themes emerged from the data that were independent of the sub-questions; these themes are addressed after the discussion relating specifically to the sub-questions. A discussion of the findings will help to place this study in relation to the literature.

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, the reader is provided with my understandings of the respondents' perceptions regarding the process of CS and its relationship to their feelings of collegiality, professional development, and teacher isolation in the school. Second, a discussion of how teachers feel administrative support affects the process of CS is provided.

Collegiality

For the purpose of this study, collegiality has been defined as when teachers (a) work together, (b) are familiar with one another's work, (c) share ideas about teaching practice and (d) help each other to make their teaching better for students and themselves. The focus of their observations and discussions is on teacher growth. An analysis of the data revealed seven categories of comments concerning collegiality, namely: (a) building rapport, (b) increased comfort level with the CS process, (c) positive feedback and constructive criticism, (d) choosing the right partner, (e) process free of threat, (f) reaffirming beliefs, and (g) decision making.

Building Rapport

One notion that teachers could build the rapport that is necessary to support collegiality through the CS process was expressed by three respondents. Their sentiments were captured by Sarah, who commented:

> If you have to touch base with someone... I think having one other member on staff where you can go to, who has a similar teaching style as you do. It's nice to be able to know that that person is really in sync with yourself and you may have thought it before, but having seen them teach it makes it that much easier and you can probably

> go and bounce ideas off them and see how they would approach certain things. That's helpful.

Sarah seemed more willing to approach her teaching partner with educational issues, than someone with whom she had not observed teaching. The rapport they had developed allowed her to feel more trusting with her partner. Bob expressed a similar idea, however he extended his argument to include all staff in the school:

> I think it [CS] builds rapport. I think the more you work together in a very close thing like this, I think you become better and you have a much better communication among staff, stronger staff rapport. I think it's really good for that.

Bob felt that if everyone was involved in a process such as CS, the entire school would develop stronger feelings of rapport. His reasoning was that since everyone would be working on helping each other with their teaching, stronger feelings of collegiality would develop. Lynn felt that her relationship with her teaching partner would offer her further support:

> I guess if you have a weak point or if you have a difficult class...you don't have to keep it to yourself, that other teachers are there to offer you ideas. We've [with her teaching partner] been through some experiences, so sharing comes out of it.

Lynn believed that by being open with a teaching partner and by sharing difficulties experienced in teaching, she could build good rapport with that person. Debbie explained how if she experienced a problem, she could get feedback from her partner to "try to change things" without feeling threatened or demeaned.

Increased Comfort Level with Collaborative Supervision

Four teachers noted that as they completed more iterations of the CS cycle, they became progressively more comfortable with the process and their partners. Evidently, this is a process that takes considerable time. Sue explained herself this way:

> At first you're a little nervous because you don't know what to expect, but after that everything went well.

Sue felt more comfortable as she and her partner progressed through the cycles. Lynn felt that with continued practice the CS process would further develop feelings of collegiality between her and her partner:

> It would be something that would become like second nature.

Similarly, Debbie expressed some difficulty with the process initially because she found it hard to first decide what to focus on; however, as time went on and more CS cycles were completed, it became easier to identify and share relevant concerns with her partner.

Positive Feedback and Constructive Criticism

All of the teachers interviewed expressed overwhelmingly how they found the feedback they received to be a very important aspect of CS. The teachers felt that the comments contributed to the collaborative relationship they were building with their teaching partners. Bob spoke about the comments in the CS process as follows:

> Comments were very positive. It was really, really open for one thing and very honest and I could really receive and take everything that my partner has to say. I felt really good about it, really, really good and I did even apply or I started changing some of the aspects of my classroom situation just because of the things that I was not necessarily conscious of doing. It was very positive.

Laura also felt very satisfied with the comments and feedback she had received from her teaching partner:

> It lets you go out there and feel like you're walking on cloud nine and your doing a good job and you're getting positive feedback. And they're saying things that maybe they weren't supposed to be observing but they bring up other positive things that they saw and say, "Gee, this is a good idea. Maybe I'm going to try this in my classroom. I like the way you did this" so it's a really good feeling.

Although many of the teachers expressed the sentiment that they were very happy with the positive comments, others believed that constructive criticism or suggestions for improvement were a valuable part of the CS process. Bill put it this way:

> I felt that the comments were constructive and non-threatening. I was very relaxed and I must say that Bob pointed out some very good things that even as an experienced teacher, you know, I wasn't aware of. So I found it very constructive and very relaxing.

Bill and Bob were operating on a very collegial level; they could discuss not only the positive aspects of the observed lesson, but also potential areas for growth. Later on in his interview, Bill commented on how he and his teaching partner did not agree on a particular aspect of a lesson during post-observation conference:

> The things that Bob mentioned, one of the things that he mentioned was that there was a very long oral session and the kids were getting a bit bored. And as an experienced teacher, I certainly know that you adjust your teaching to the kids sometimes. And I'm aware of that but I felt that I still had the kids and it was still a productive lesson.

Bob had felt comfortable enough in his relationship with Bill to point this out to him, but Bill had not agreed with him. Bill continued to say that this comment did not impede their discussion or cause any undue stress between the two. Both teachers were able to respect each other for their opinions. Bill was able to maintain his autonomy by taking the information his teaching partner was providing and deciding what to do with it. Both colleagues trusted each other enough in this situation to feel comfortable with each others' decisions. Bill said that he appreciated not only the positive feedback he received, but also "the negatives." He felt that he had received constructive criticism from his partner that was valid and that it had become a learning situation for him.

Choosing the Right Partner

In order to have a collegial relationship, teaching partners had to find a person with whom they felt they could work well. This is supported by all of the teachers. When asked how they went about choosing their partners, they explained it in various but similar ways. Sarah said:

> Probably I decided on someone who I knew I got along with really well on staff, and who I would feel comfortable with, and who I felt would give me an honest observation and someone who was a friend as well.

Bill suggested that his choice was made because he was "very comfortable" with Bob. Sue echoed this, and added that having "similar teaching styles, being close in proximity," and she and her partner "teaching combined grade classes" were also factors. Debbie suggested that since she had already been working with her partner on various teaching units, Sue was a logical choice for her. They could continue to develop a collegial relationship. Bob stated that he wanted to choose someone with whom he was "at ease" :

> Then I would feel confident in the feedback and it would be someone that would really try to be understanding of my situation and vice versa. We had taught together many grades, and I think for three years Bill has been one of my closest persons on staff that I've been sharing materials with, experiences with. So we understand one another and we communicate back and forth very much. So we've done planning together and there is very positive trust among us.

An issue for Bob was that the person had to be someone he could trust, someone that would be understanding of his perspective and his feelings. Lynn pointed out that she was interested in working with a partner that taught the same subjects at the same grade level. Speaking about her partner, Lynn said that it helped that they were located across the hall from each other. Laura felt that she and her partner would benefit from working with each other because they both had "children with difficult behavior" in the classroom. All of the teachers expressed a desire to work with someone with whom they would be able to have a collegial relationship in which they could work together in an effort to help each other grow professionally by offering support to each other.

Process Free of Threat

Several of the teachers also indicated that they wanted to participate in CS because they felt that this process was free of the “threat” that is often perceived during evaluation. Debbie indicated this:

> It was nice that the person watching you was not sort of evaluating you, you didn’t have to have a perfect lesson sort of thing. They weren’t there to evaluate or anything, they were just focusing on that one thing. And you knew what it was so you could work on that.

She felt more comfortable with a process that did not include someone drawing judgements regarding parts of her lesson that she was not focusing on. She felt free to concentrate on the one area that she had asked her partner to observe. Bob expressed a similar sentiment:

> You know when you have an evaluator come into your class, ...you always feel threatened. I don’t know...unless you know your principal extremely well and you know you have been working together for years and there’s very strong trust, then you can communicate back and forth really openly. But I don’t think you can usually because you feel like you have to perform because this is going on your file.

Bob has not felt very comfortable in his evaluations conducted by administrators. In his relationship with his teaching partner, he felt that the threat of evaluation had been removed from the situation and he felt he was able to work on areas of growth without worrying that he would be evaluated. Bill mentioned a similar feeling regarding attempts by previous administrators to work with him in a formative relationship:

> It [CS] was also non-threatening. No matter how an administrator tries to reassure you, there's still a bit of pressure when you get a vice-principal or a principal to come in and observe you and make suggestions or observations on what they have observed. I felt much more comfortable doing it with a colleague. I was very relaxed. I found it constructive and very relaxing.

Bill added that he did not feel the slightest bit nervous with Bob, that it had been a very natural process. He also indicated that working with a non-threatening partner made him feel that having someone observe in the classroom was good practice.

Reaffirming Beliefs

Another element that was discussed by teachers revolved around how teachers can use the process of CS to reaffirm their beliefs that "what they are doing is what they should be doing." Sarah put it this way: "We weren't sure that we were addressing certain issues in the classroom and I guess it was a sort of confirmation or finding out more or less what areas we were weak or strong in...."

The feedback the teachers received from their partners allowed them to feel that the strategies and methods that they were using were appropriate for the various situations. Dana thought of it as a reminder of all the things that she did do:

> I think you're aware of what you're doing when you're teaching, but you're not always aware of everything you're doing, so I think that when someone tells you that you are doing it, it makes you think, "Oh yes, I do that!" When you're teaching you really don't have time to think about all that you're doing....

Again, Dana received confirmation from her teaching partner that she was doing the things that she ought to do, although she was not fully aware of doing those things all the time. Debbie echoed this sentiment, saying that:

> It's amazing how many things that you do, how many little warnings and signals and things that you do without even knowing that you're doing it.

Decision Making

Another aspect of collegiality is the ability to discuss teaching with one's teaching partner, to make decisions about what ought to happen in the classroom. CS offered opportunities for teachers to make autonomous decisions about their own teaching, or if desired, to make decisions in consultation with the teaching partner. Debbie commented on how she and her partner entered into discussions about the focus of their observations, and came to joint decisions about about further foci, based on their discussions. Sue and her partner stated that they often sat down and brainstormed various ideas, before each making a decision. The final choice was made individually, after the consultation. Bob and Bill indicated that in their discussions about the foci for future observations, they thought about what they had discussed previously, but that the each made decisions about the focus of their next observation. Laura indicated that she and her partner sat down together to discuss possibilities, then decided individually on the focus of their observations. It seems that the process of CS allowed teachers the opportunity to discuss issues if desired, and to use that information for either joint or individual decision making on the teachers' part.

Professional Development

In this study, professional development has been defined as when teachers want to learn and to grow professionally. The focus is on personal growth to improve instruction. An analysis of the data has revealed six categories, namely: (a) learning through observation, (b) benefits of conferencing, (c) implementing change, (d) lack of threat, (e) higher level thinking as sessions progressed, and (f) alternative approaches to the CS experience.

Learning Through Observation.

By far, the most frequently described strength of CS for the teachers in this study was the opportunity to share ideas about teaching with colleagues. All of the teachers involved felt that they had gained much from both the observations and the discussions that ensued. Dana commented that:

> I think that it's good to be in someone else's classroom because it's nice to be able to see what other people are doing. And so I think you learn from another person, from another colleague that way. It's fun and it's interesting to see to watch how things go on in another classroom.

Later on in her interview, Dana added:

> It's nice to be able to see how she interacts with her kids, it's nice to see how the kids interact with her, and it's nice to see, as far as discipline is concerned, what she does. And even though you're focusing on one thing for observations, you still notice the rest of it...I think it makes you more aware, more open.

Dana felt that through her observations, she had had the opportunity to learn as well. Even though at that time she was involved in collecting data for her partner, she still had the opportunity to observe and reflect on the classroom processes for her own benefit. Laura agreed with this as well, she stated that "often teachers forget little things over time and that being in another teacher's classroom allows you to remember some of the little things that you should be doing but may not have been doing recently," She suggested that it "stimulates you. You get so many different ideas." Similarly, Sarah thought that she had "picked up on things" that she would probably try to implement in her own classroom. She said:

> For me, I think that it probably sparks some new ideas, creativity. It did for me. I had the opportunity to watch and see how someone else does it and then apply it to my teaching in my classroom.

Bob indicated that people learn from other people how to do things; that we learn to appreciate what is going on in other classrooms. Lynn suggested that both she and her partner implemented lessons and ideas that they had seen in each other's classrooms. Sue felt that having someone in her classroom spurred her on to put more effort into her lessons than she would usually do. She felt that this was a good motivator for her to improve her teaching.

Benefits of Conferencing.

There are several benefits to CS that were addressed by the respondents in this study, namely: (a) allowing the teachers to grow in a non-threatening environment, (b) providing teachers with opportunities to be self-critical, (c) providing teachers with opportunities to become more motivated about their teaching, (d) providing opportunities for teachers to become more self-aware of their actions in the classroom, and (e) providing opportunities to learn through observation and through brainstorming in conferences.

Growth in a non-threatening environment. Sue stated how she felt the process of CS provided her with an opportunity to grow professionally in a non-threatening environment:

> The process is a great learning experience for teachers. I also personally believe that you never stop learning as a teacher and it's always good to get feedback from your colleagues in a non-threatening way.....they're just there to help you and to give you suggestions and to give you positive feedback on the things that are going on in your classroom that are going really well.

Sue had obviously felt like she had benefited from the discussions with her teaching partner. Sue also appreciated the non-threatening environment and stated that CS encouraged her to work harder on her lesson preparation as a result of having a teaching partner observing in her classroom:

> It kind of spurs you on to continue what you are doing in your classroom. You know I pull from a few more resources that I might have otherwise. I think there are enormous benefits. I just feel that it is a non-threatening situation and it allows you to ask someone else to come and look at your lesson and say "Am I doing whatever?" and they'll come back and say yes or no. Then you can work from there. Either you do or don't have to continue working on it anymore...it's something that you don't have to put further emphasis on.

Opportunities to be self-critical. Sue seemed to think that the CS process allowed her the opportunity to evaluate her own teaching and to decide if an area warranted attention for further growth, or if she ought to change her focus to a different area.

> ...it allows you to ask someone else to come and look at your lesson and say "Am I doing whatever?" and they'll come back and say yes or no. Then you can work from there. Either you do or don't have to continue working on it anymore...it's something that you don't have to put further emphasis on.

Opportunities to become more motivated. Lynn felt that the CS process motivated her to continue to work hard in an effort to provide the best instruction she could in a very demanding profession:

> The most important thing is that it is sort of a pat on the back. You realize that you are doing a good job, it motivates you to keep working hard and to not get negative, which can sometimes happen in teaching with all the extra work. But I think it is just a positive experience because it's your peer saying, "Hey, great lesson!" or "That's a really neat idea. I'm going to try that" and vice versa. So it's very positive.

Increasing self-awareness. Bob felt that the conference allowed both he and his partner to help each other become more aware of their own teaching strategies and practices:

> I wanted to have his feedback on how the actual situation

> was happening, but you know, after having discussed it, I have a better idea. I'm more aware of things. Even in my questioning, and my repetition, my speed of delivery.... It just made more aware so I think of things that I'm doing and how students responded to things....I wanted to help Bill in giving him feedback on what he wanted to improve on and likewise for myself. I wanted to have his opinion on how I was performing or how I was doing some lessons, having suggestions for improvement. I asked him to look and watch very carefully....

Further clarification with Bob confirmed that he found the conferencing process to be very valuable. Furthermore, he wanted his partner to be very specific about his comments so that he could make judgements about the information and apply it to his teaching. Bob wanted to get an objective evaluation of his teaching from his partner in a "safe environment." He was sincere in wanting to help his teaching partner by providing him with the best feedback that he could.

Sarah felt that she had the opportunity to have someone watch for things that she might have missed in her teaching, "things that she wanted to address in the future." By talking with her partner, her awareness of what those things were would increase and she could focus on them in her teaching.

All of the teachers felt very positive that they benefited from the discussions held during the pre-observation conference and the post-observation conferences. Bill found the suggestions he received from his teaching partner very helpful. He commented that:

> I think you've got serious, competent professionals who are interested in improving and reflecting on what they are doing. Like Bob and I didn't go into the session and talk about hockey, Patrick Roy. It's very constructive. People genuinely want to improve and I think this helps. You learn about your teaching styles.

Lynn felt that she benefited from conferencing with her partner, particularly in receiving some positive feedback and sharing ideas that she had discussed. She later added that she thought it was a very good way for her to "monitor her teaching."

Laura thought that she had learned from her conferences:

> It makes you aware of different strategies to use. You get ideas from other teachers and you bounce back ideas from each other.

Laura felt that she had gained new strategies and through her discussions with her partner she came to a new perspective about teaching practice. Sue later stated that "the crunch" of the whole [CS] process was to allow teachers to get together to discuss what goes on in classrooms, thus giving teachers an opportunity to learn from one another.

Implementing Change

Another notion about professional development that was shared by all of the teachers was the that the process allowed them opportunities to implement change in their teaching. Not only were they made aware of other ideas, techniques, and methods related to teaching, but they were also able to implement some of these in their classrooms. Bill made these comments:

> I must say that from observing Bob, there's something that I observed from him that spoke to me, and that's just body position. We tend to teach on one side of the blackboard and there's a tendency to forget the kids in the front corners. You always have to be ...what's the term in English, "Balai ton regard"[a sweeping gaze across the classroom]? You're sweeping, like keeping eye contact with the entire group. It's something that I know that I have to watch... it's something that I'm more aware of.

This is a situation where one teaching partner has implemented a change in his classroom, based on observations made in his partner's classroom. Bill recognized the lack of eye contact with all students as an area of growth for his partner, and after reflecting on it, he recognized it as an area of growth for himself as well. He now monitors eye contact with students in his own teaching.

Dana also felt that she had implemented change in her classroom as a result of CS. She and her partner were monitoring the amount of times they said "sh" during a lesson in an effort to keep the noise down, because it was not a strategy that either teacher found desirable. They were both quite surprised at the number of times that they did use it. As a result of their increased awareness, both teachers decided to avoid using this strategy altogether. Dana said: "You're not aware of some of the things you say, and then you try to change it because then you are aware." Debbie explained her implementing classroom change this way:

> One of the ones we did was questioning. And I think because you were concentrating on doing it, I asked a lot more questions than I normally would. So I think since then I've kept doing that. So I read a story and asked questions while I was reading the story, but alot more questions than I would normally ask. So I've sort of kept doing that and keep that up. I think it's good for the kids.

Debbie claims to have learned from her experience and has maintained this changed behavior in her classroom ever since discussing it with Dana. She felt positive that the improvement in her teaching would be of benefit to her students.

Bob also decided to implement change in his classroom:

> I started changing some of the aspects of my classroom situation just because of things that I was not necessarily conscious of doing and suggestions [from his teaching partner]...I'm more aware of things...Different things that I can try to now change and be more consistent on.

Lack of Threat

The idea that CS is an effective means for teachers to learn about their teaching due to lack of threat surfaced with all the teachers. Bob and Bill both indicated that they felt the process was very threat free when compared to an administrator evaluation. Bill stated:

> It [CS] was very constructive and it was non-threatening. I felt much more comfortable doing it with a colleague. I was very relaxed. We have the conference immediately, low pressure, we didn't have to do a bunch of paperwork.

Bill felt that he was much more at ease working with his teaching partner than he would have been working with an administrator. He expressed his dislike for filling out forms and the added pressure working with an administrator caused him. He later added that he appreciated not having the "extra work" that he would have had in an evaluation done by a supervisor. Sue also indicated that she felt much more comfortable with her partner because she knew that she was not "evaluating you" but was there to help you. She felt it was good to get feedback from colleagues in a "non-threatening way." Dana also believed that CS was "not a threat."

Higher Level Thinking as Sessions Progress

One of the teachers presented a different notion in regards to professional development. Lynn indicated that as her sessions progressed with her partner, the pair addressed more difficult teaching strategies as well:

> I think initially we picked out some of the obvious things that we could work on. We did the third and fourth time and it started getting ...well we'd better think about this and what we could work on -- sort of more in depth things. The initial ones were the most obvious ones like enthusiasm in the classroom and things like that. And then we started thinking about higher level thinking as we progressed. I think we got into more in-depth things.

Lynn seemed to think that as they became more focused on higher level thinking skills and techniques, that the sessions seemed to hold more value for her.

Alternative Approaches to CS

Two of the teachers indicated that the process of CS would also be very valuable for teachers in terms of professional development if some alternative approaches were attempted. Both Bob and Bill indicated that they would like to continue the process, but at some point that they would like to undertake the process with a different colleague. Bill indicated that he would like to enter into the process with the other grade six teacher, because he felt it would be very valuable for him to work with a teacher who taught the same curriculum as him. He felt that he would benefit from someone else's intrepretation and implementation of the grade six units, as well as from observing different teaching styles. He also felt that during a professional development day, it would be valuable for all teachers involved in CS to share some thoughts about the process and what they had learned. Bob indicated that he would like to continue with the process of CS and to work with other teachers on staff. He said he would like to work with those on staff with whom he is not very familiar, and even perhaps working with teachers of lower grade levels. He stated:

> Just to build, even to understand, to learn to appreciate what they're doing in their classrooms, in a more equal manner.

Teacher Isolation

Teachers often experience a sense of isolation in schools. Many of the teachers involved in this study indicated that they normally had very little opportunity to spend time in any other classroom but their own. This led to Dana's concern:

> So I think it's [CS] useful, and it's fun and it's interesting to watch how things go on in another class because we really hardly ever have that opportunity... it's nice because you really don't ever have a chance to be in another classroom.

Laura echoed this concern and also indicated that when her teaching partner did come into her classroom, she initially felt uncomfortable:

> It's just nice to see somebody else teach. At first we didn't know quite what we were doing, but then once you get into the roll of it, into the swing of things, then you feel more comfortable...the more it didn't bother me having someone else in my classroom.

Laura felt somewhat uncomfortable with her partner as they began their classroom observations, experiencing a feeling of insecurity. But as they worked with each other she began to feel more comfortable and more trusting of the person observing her. She began to "break down some of the walls" that long term isolation had built up. This corresponded to an increased feeling of rapport with her partner.

Laura was not alone with the feeling that CS could build rapport and reduce feelings of isolation amongst teachers. Sarah felt that she would like to work collaboratively with someone once per month because she appreciated "touching base" with someone regarding her teaching. She said that she appreciated working with someone who had a similar teaching style, someone with whom she could "bounce ideas off of" and see how they would approach different things. Debbie indicated that she thought that the entire school would benefit from CS because it would allow teachers in the school to have more access to each other, both as a source of ideas and for teaching and moral support. She felt that this kind of rapport school wide would positively affect the culture of the school. Lynn suggested that CS allowed teachers opportunities to share problems confidentially with another person on staff. Laura felt that the process of sharing strategies for addressing student behaviors, especially those students the teachers had in common, led to increased rapport between the teachers. Teachers agreed that these consultative behaviors could decrease the feelings of isolation felt by teachers by giving them someone with whom to dialogue.

Administrative Support

All teachers in this study indicated that administrative support was necessary to be able to implement the process of CS. The discussion of administrative support focused on four topics, namely: (a) time, (b) providing information, (c) receiving encouragement and recognition, and (d) indirect involvement of administration.

Time

The issue of "having time" to engage in CS was raised by all of the teachers. For them, release time to observe each other and to pre- and post-conference was absolutely essential. Bob expressed it this way:

> I think that the fact that the principal went and covered

> for us and the fact that you came and covered for us, gave us time. I think the time planning was very appropriate.

Dana, agreeing with Bob, stressed that not having to use her own planning or personal time made the process palatable:

> I mean you came and you covered our classes and you gave us time, during school time to do this. I mean the first time we did it after school, but then we thought, well, we'll do it during school time because you had said that we could do that and it was good.

Sue further stated that she never felt any "pressure to hurry up and get the conferencing done," she felt that the time needed to properly engage in CS had been provided. Teachers indicated that release time, for which they did not have to create extensive plans for a substitute teacher was absolutely necessary for their participation. Laura expressed that she really liked the fact that the administration was flexible with the scheduling by allowing for last minute changes and rescheduling because of unexpected occurrences.

Providing Information and Resources

Providing teachers with the information they needed to be able to successfully participate in CS was important to one half of the teachers. They indicated that they were happy to have had the information session and the handouts that provided them with "specifics" about the CS process. They further expressed that they were pleased to have received the list of possible topics for their classroom observations. Since the teachers were at various levels of professional development, providing information and possible observation topics gave them a starting point. Sue and Debbie also mentioned that they would appreciate a more "varied list" of possibilities from which they could select foci for observations. The initial list had provided these two teachers with a few options, but they experienced some difficulty in establishing their own topics. Other teachers simply used the initial list as a reference point and set their own criteria for observations in future sessions. Lynn stated that she appreciated the fact that the administration helped her to "initially find out what the program was all about."

Receiving Encouragement and Recognition

Recognition and encouragement from the administration were important for three of the teachers involved in this study. Sarah commented:

> I think if you have someone who supports what you are doing, you're more likely to try this more often.

She felt that if she was encouraged to participate in the process, she would be more willing to participate more frequently. Laura agreed and added:

> They [administration] encouraged us to try it, which I think is really good. Sometimes you need a little boost to try different things...

Laura felt that it was important for administration to promote professional development within the school, and appreciated being introduced and encouraged along during her involvement with CS. Bob felt quite strongly about administrative support:

> The principal right now is the main evaluator, you know I think if he gives his consent or if he really supports the program, and I think he really feels it, otherwise it has no bearing. If it's not recognized as being a valid experience for teachers, you know you would still benefit from it, but it wouldn't be as valued or as important a process. So I think the more things you do together, the more there is support for one thing, the more weight it has and the more important it becomes and I think more the outcome is beneficial.

In discussion with Bob, he addressed the benefits of CS for teachers, but he stressed that CS was much more beneficial if the teachers felt that administrators were supportive and encouraging of teacher involvement. He believed that administrators and teachers had to work together, and through teamwork, there would be very beneficial outcomes such as a school cohesiveness and a strong staff rapport.

Later in his interview, Bob added that he appreciated the discussion of the project during staff meetings, that he felt it was good for the people who were participating to receive the "praise and encouragement" in front of all staff. Bob indicated that he felt encouraged when the project was discussed with other teachers and administrators in the district, and even with the district superintendent.

Indirect Involvement of Administration

There was a comment made by a teacher that she enjoyed the fact that the school administrators were not directly involved in the process other than to provide information, time, encouragement, and recognition. Lynn said this:

> I don't think they're [the administration] looking over what you are doing. Administrative support is important if you're struggling with something -- to have the administration support there to back you up or to make sure you're getting the right help, I guess. But it's [CS] a program that runs fairly independently of administration. It's sort of between teachers. I mean if you wanted to you could do it with your principal or whatever, but it's a program where it's easily run just between teachers.

Lynn seemed to think that she was free from having administration watch her in this process. Administrative support was appreciated; equally appreciated was that the administrators in the school were not directly involved in the CS process.

Unanticipated Findings

During the process of analyzing the data, two underlying issues became apparent to me. These included: (a) the great amount of time needed to engage in a program of CS, and (b) the apparent influence of the size of the school staff on CS. These are addressed, in turn, below.

Amount of Time Spent Collaborating

All of the teachers in this study expressed some concern about the great amount of time they needed to participate in CS. Seven of the teachers indicated that they felt that they were given adequate time by the administration through coverage of classes. Laura suggested that the administration's flexibility in covering classes allowed them to deal with unexpected schedule changes that occurred in the school. Bill concurred, saying that:

> One other thing is that it is not an add-on for us. We're all so busy -- I started mine at the end of November. If I'm filling out forms or I have to make sub plans, it's more work. The way you have administered it, it's something a little different, it's not extra work -- it hasn't been another worry.

These teachers felt that planning a lesson for a substitute teacher took considerable time, and added extra pressure. The fact that the coverage was done by someone who did their own planning and just "took over the class," freeing the teachers from the responsibility of planning for that time was appreciated. Bob agreed with this comment, saying:

> I think the time planning was very appropriate. I think the fact that you were ready and having even materials of your own and getting your lesson, was really well done.

Lynn indicated that when she and her teaching partner did use a recess break for a post-observation conference discussion, it was a "shortened version" of what would otherwise have happened. Bob also commented on the time that he and his partner allocated for their pre-observation conferences and suggested that he would have liked to have spent more time on them, but that coverage had not been provided for pre-conferences, only for observations and post-observation conferences.

Another concern was expressed by Lynn in regards to time. She felt that since she was a part-time staff-member working with a full-time staff member, it seemed that whenever she was in the school, she was planning for or involved in CS. She found this somewhat stressful. She suggested that if she were at the school full-time, she would not likely feel this way. For Lynn, the time that the process took was overwhelming since she was at the school only one and a half days per week.

Generally, all of the teachers felt that they had little time for extra duties in their daily schedule. They appreciated being released from their normal classroom teaching time to participate in CS.

Size of the School Staff

It seems that the size of the school staff may limit a teacher's choice in what they perceive to be a good teaching partner. Dana indicated this:

> There were very few English people and so Debbie and I decided that we would do it [CS] together. We found that with the English program there really wasn't a whole bunch of choice.

Dana was not indicating displeasure in her choice of a partner, but merely stating that since in the school there were only five teachers who taught in the English program, it limited her options in choosing a partner with whom she could work, as compared to the rest of the staff, 15 in all, in the French Immersion program. Debbie confirmed this feeling as well. These English program teachers felt that they were at a disadvantage in a French Immersion classroom because of an inability to understand the language. They would have experienced difficulty in collecting verbal data from the classroom situation if they could not understand the language.

Discussion of Findings

The findings from this chapter will be discussed using the main ideas of the four research sub-questions, the unanticipated findings and the general research question. The main ideas of the sub-questions and unanticipated findings are as follows: (a) developing feelings of collegiality, (b) professional development value of CS, (c) reducing teacher isolation, (d) effects of administrative support, (e) amount of time spent collaborating, and (f) size of school staff. The main idea of the main research question is risk taking and innovative teaching. A comparison of the findings to the literature will also be presented.

Developing Feelings of Collegiality

This sub-section addresses potential responses to the first research sub-question: “Can CS help to develop feelings of collegiality amongst teachers?” The findings suggested that the CS process allowed teachers to build rapport with their teaching partners. They began to establish solid relationships based on the idea that they were there to help each other with any aspect related to the process of teaching. They shared positive feedback as well as constructive criticism with each other in a trusting environment. The process was not seen as threatening by the teachers, although some teachers indicated that early in the process that they did experience some discomfort because of their lack of familiarity with the process and the partner. As their relationships progressed, teachers began to feel more comfortable with the process, as well as with each other. This comfort with each other can best be described as resulting from a collegial relationship. Collegiality, as Sergiovanni (1992) stated, is quite different from congeniality. Sergiovanni (1992) described collegiality as “teachers having the proper professional attitude or orientation.” He described congeniality as a display of loyalty, trust, and easy conversation, but lacking a focus on their work: an obligation to work together for a common good" (Sergiovanni, 1992). By this definition, the teachers participating in this study were working in a collegial fashion. The process allows them to build their self-concept through peer praise and encouragement (Goldhammer, 1993; Little, 1982). Bang-Jensen (1986) discussed how teachers can build trusting relationships, where they could have the freedom to take risks to try different strategies in their teaching.

The findings also suggested that the teachers began to support each other more and would approach each other for assistance in problem solving. Bang-Jensen (1986) suggested that teachers begin to develop empathy for one another as they continued to work together, this further strengthens the rapport between teachers.

The teachers suggested that working with a teaching partner was less threatening to them than working with an administrator who is also responsible for teacher evaluation. The teachers developed a stronger level of trust with their teaching partners. Zumwalt (1986) discussed how teachers are more apt to learn from each other and to develop professionally through a collegial relationship than through other situations. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) agreed and said that there is often difficulty in developing a true collegial relationship with someone who is also a supervisor, or who is involved in evaluation of teachers (Bang-

Jensen, 1986; Haughey, et al., 1993; Garman, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1992; Grimmett, 1992; Little, 1987).

Professional Development Value of Collaborative Supervision

The second sub-question is addressed in this sub-section, namely: "Do teachers perceive that the CS process has value for their professional development? The participants from Keywest school were very definite about what they had learned from working with their teaching partners. They felt that the most important learning facet of CS for them was that they had an opportunity to share ideas about teaching. Through their discussions, they learned about different aspects of their own teaching, that perhaps they were not aware of or had forgotten over time. Sandell and Sullivan (1991) described how teachers can get good feedback and develop very supportive relationships when working with a colleague. Little (1982) discussed the idea of teacher collaboration providing teachers with an opportunity to develop a self-awareness of their teaching techniques. Grimmett (1992) talked about how teachers make sense of their own experiences through discussions about those experiences with other teachers. Grimmett (1992) talked about the concept of how teachers need to reflect on what they have done, relate it to their own experiences, and based on that information choose to make changes (Goldhammer, et al.,1993;

Acheson & Gall 1992). Grimmett (1992) discussed how through this reflection process teaching can improve. The teachers in this study were reflecting on what they had seen, either in their own teaching or in their partners' teaching. Regardless of who had been observed, each member of the dyad was able to take the information from that discussion and apply it to their own teaching practice. In some cases, teachers would apply what they had learned to their own teaching patterns for assurances that they were implementing the technique. If not, then teachers would attempt to do so. These teachers were reflective about their teaching on the basis of what Schon (1983) and Garman (1990) described as reflection-on-action. They suggested that reflection includes thinking about the teaching, basing it on past experiences and trying out new scenarios. Reflection continues as teachers evaluate the effects of the new changes implemented and in terms of the appraisals of the outcomes.

Teachers developed an appreciation for what happened in other classrooms, not only through the focus of the observations, but also through general observations of things that occurred or were present in the classroom while they were there. Some teachers mentioned that they put more effort into their work and implemented changes in their own teaching as a result of having worked with their teaching partner. It was obvious from the comments that teachers would reaffirm some of their own beliefs about teaching, and make some changes based on their experiences with their teaching partners. Nolan and Francis (1992) described how teachers working collaboratively can, through discussions and observations, generate new knowledge about their teaching practice. Glickman (1995) stated that the discussion generated by teachers in a collegial relationship can be concrete and precise, based on the teachers' needs and strengths, and that these discussions can lead to analysis and critical thinking about their teaching. He stated that as teacher choice and control increases, instructional improvement can occur.

The findings indicated that the teachers were also very comfortable with their partners and felt that they were working in a relatively "threat-free" and low risk environment. Haughey, et al. (1993) indicated in their report that teachers perceived themselves to be more likely to experience growth in a collegial relationship than through formal evaluation. The teachers in this study felt that their collegial relationship allowed them opportunities to work in a threat-free environment where they could focus on exactly what they wanted to, to direct their growth (Smyth 1991). Haughey, et al. (1993) suggested that teachers should be treated as experts in their own field. The teachers in this study were sharing ideas and expertise in an effort to assist each other in their professional growth. Glickman (1995) spoke of the need for teachers to engage in reflection on teaching, and to attempt to problem solve as these teachers were doing. The teachers' behaviors changed in some cases because they had practised and critiqued themselves with the help of their teaching partners, and subsequently they had applied the results to new teaching situations (Bang-Jensen, 1986). Both Nolan and Francis (1992) and Little (1982) indicated that through collaboration, teachers can reflect and generate new knowledge, as the teachers in this study have done.

The respondents in this study felt that the decisions about choices of goals and activities in the CS process as well as the decisions to make changes in their teaching rested with them. Although teachers did indicate in some cases that they had made decisions collaboratively, the teachers were happy to retain the option to make decisions. Waite (1995) and Glickman (1995) felt that this was a very important component of a collaborative relationship. They believed that teachers should have the autonomy to decide about what was best for their own development. In this study, the final decisions were always the teachers' to make, even though there may have been collaborative discussion prior to the decision making.

Reducing Teacher Isolation

This section addresses potential responses to the sub-question: "Can CS help to reduce feelings of isolation amongst teachers?" Teachers in this study indicated that they felt isolated in their classrooms and described how nice it was to have the opportunity to visit another classroom during a lesson. This did not occur on a regular basis for teachers, it was quite a rarity if it occurred at all. Lortie (1975) talked extensively of the isolation of the classroom teacher. He discussed how schools are not set up to facilitate the collaboration of teachers because of either their physical layout or the scheduling of classes. Teachers have little free time outside of the classroom, little time when they are not responsible for students, consequently, there is little time left over to allocate to collaboration with other teachers. When they do have preparation time, it is unlikely that another teacher is available at the same time. This makes collaboration very difficult. Lortie (1975) and Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1995) suggested that if collaboration can somehow occur, it can help to break down the isolation that teachers experience. Sergiovanni (1992) also spoke of about how collaboration could help to overcome isolation and of the potential to build collegial norms within a school. He suggested that, as educators, we need to recognize this and slow the pace of teaching to allow teachers time to reflect on what they are doing in the classroom. Collaborative supervision allowed teachers to experience observations in each other's classrooms and follow-up discussions which helped to increase the rapport teachers had with their teaching partner. As rapport developed, teachers felt able to go to one another for help or to share ideas. This kind of increased rapport could help to break down the isolation of the classroom, and build more collegiality amongst the staff.

Effects of Administrative Support

The sub-question addressed in this sub-section is, namely: “What effect does administrative support have on CS?” Administrative support seemed to have substantial effect on the teachers' perceptions of the value of CS. School administration was seen as key in providing teachers with the introduction to the program (e.g., an orientation session and provision of lists with potential topics for CS cycles). Smyth (1991) talked about the importance of making sure that staff are fully aware of what they are embarking on. He was a strong supporter of an orientation program, similar to that used at Keywest School, where teachers can get all of the information necessary to be able to successfully participate in a program of CS. He also believed that teachers should make sure that they understand the process and clarify it with their partners before beginning.

Praise, encouragement, and recognition for being involved in the program by the administration were also cited as being important to the teachers for their continued support. Some teachers in this study suggested that they also appreciated being recognized in public forums where all of their colleagues were present. Goldhammer (1993), Dillon-Peterson (1986), Acheson and Gall (1992), and Smyth (1991) were proponents of the idea that support and encouragement by administration is important. They felt that the support has to be on-site and relevant to the teachers to encourage them to continue in their efforts towards self growth.

Administrative support had two important components. First, no direct involvement by administrators in the CS process was seen as a strength, and second, it was appreciated by teachers that administrators provided release time during the school day to allow participation in observations and post-observation conferences.

Teachers felt that the CS process was free of the evaluative component that is often perceived when administrators are involved. The fact that the teachers did not have to take the time to write lesson plans for substitute teachers as the administrators provided their own, was appreciated by the teachers involved. These ideas are supported by the literature. Krajewski (1993), Darling-Hammond (1992), Garman (1990), Little (1987), Zumwalt (1986) and da Costa (1993) have suggested that a non-threatening environment where there is a high degree of trust helps to develop mutual rapport amongst teachers. In order for CS to be successful, it must be free of threat or teachers will not take the risks they need to achieve growth. This is not to say that a relationship with an administrator cannot be free of threat. But the teachers in this study felt that whenever an administrator was involved in supervision there was a corresponding element of threat present.

Both Smyth (1988) and Garman (1990) believed that teachers often feel that administrators are inspecting and monitoring their teaching, rather than focusing on teacher growth. Glickman (1995) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) agreed that teachers often fear that a judgement will be made of them and of their teaching when an administrator is involved. Acheson and Gall (1992) suggested that the directive style of many administrators undermines the confidence of teachers during supervision. Goldsberry (1984) put forth that it was the status of the supervisor that could somewhat inhibit the teacher, that if the supervisor held a position of administration or was a district consultant who is seen as being an expert, teachers would feel that their performance may not reach the same standards as the supervisor.

Administration holds a very important role in supporting teachers by offering them release time during the school day. Teachers in this study seemed to feel that they would not have been able to participate fully if they had not been provided with release time. It seemed to be a condition of the continuation of their involvement. Dillon-Peterson (1986) talked about how necessary it was for teachers to be provided with financial or time resources so that they could take the time to focus and plan - components necessary for CS. Administrators need to allocate money from budgets for substitute teachers, or be available to provide the release time themselves, as what occurred in this study (Smyth, 1991). No literature was found addressing the aspect of administration providing their own lesson plans.

Discussion of Unanticipated Findings

Amount of Time Spent Collaborating

A theme that presented itself that was not addressed by the sub-questions, although it was addressed in the literature, was the concept of time. In particular, how much time is necessary to be able to participate in CS. Dillon-Peterson (1986) and Smyth (1991) both have indicated that the process of CS is a very time consuming activity. As a result CS requires considerable administrative support for teachers to willingly participate. Teachers would not have the time to participate if they were not freed up during the school day. The teachers in this study indicated that they were able to become involved because they felt that the school administration provided them with sufficient release time. They also stated that if that had not been possible, it would have been very difficult for them to find the time to participate in their already busy schedules. One of the teachers indicated that even though she was provided with classroom coverage, the fact that she worked part-time seemed to place excessive demands on the amount of time she spent collaborating. She felt that whenever she was at the school, she was participating in the project; this was found to be very difficult for her. No literature was found regarding the difficulties experienced by part-time teachers engaging in CS.

Size of the School Staff

Another theme that presented itself in the findings related to the number of the staff working at the school. Garman (1990), Darling-Hammond (1992), Little (1987) and Zumwalt (1986) all described the need for teachers and teaching partners to develop a sense of trust in order to build a collegial relationship. If the size of the teacher population from which teaching partners can be selected is small, there is the possibility that partners with whom teachers feel comfortable and could establish collegial relationships will not be found. This could discourage teachers from participating in CS. Two of the teachers at Keywest School expressed a concern that they had a smaller population of staff from which to choose their teaching partners. The two English program teachers who worked together had only five teachers from which to choose. The remaining teachers taught in the French Immersion program; since most of their teaching was done in the French language it was not possible for the English program teachers to understand what was going on while they taught. Although the group from which the English program teachers chose was small, neither of the English teaching partners expressed a dissatisfaction with each other.

Risk taking and Innovative Teaching

The general research question asked in this study was, "Do teachers perceive themselves as willing to take risks and to try innovative teaching strategies after having engaged in the CS process?" The following is offered as a potential response. The findings from this study suggest that teachers may perceive themselves as willing to take risks in their teaching. They take risks in collaborating with their teaching partners subjecting their teaching to the scrutiny of a colleague who can offer feedback and suggestions for growth. The idea that teachers will work collegially if they feel secure that relationships are based on trust is supported by Acheson and Gall (1992), Glickman (1990), and Little (1987).

These authors have stated that self development can occur if teachers work with an empathetic and supportive colleague with whom they have developed a high level of trust.

Teachers also take a risk when they decide to implement changes into their classrooms. The teachers in this study indicated that they have implemented teaching strategies observed in other classrooms that were different from what they had previously used. They also implemented ideas that they gleaned from discussions with their teaching partners. Some of these ideas were considered to be innovative, referring to strategies that they had not implemented previously. The teachers felt that the ideas they took and implemented in their own classrooms as a result of sharing were ideas that they valued and that they thought would improve their own teaching in the classroom. Zumwalt (1986) discussed how teachers collaborating provided opportunities for the discovery of alternative strategies that could be used by the teachers involved. Glickman (1995) agreed and also stated that CS gives teachers the chance to teach each other about the teaching practice. Through this practice, teachers become more reflective and attempt more innovative teaching in their classrooms. Louks-Horsley (1987) described how in a collaborative relationship experimentation occurs after teachers have observed each other teach. This process often leads to new teacher learning.

Summary of Findings

Seven major findings presented themselves as a result of the analysis of the data conducted in this study. These findings form the basis of the next chapter which addresses conclusions, recommendations, and implications emerging from the study. The findings include:

1. Teacher participation in CS with the goal of teacher growth in mind, allowed them to develop collegial relationships with their teaching partners; these relationships were characterized by working together, helping each other, and talking about their teaching practice.

2. CS did have value for teachers in terms of their professional development; the process allowed them to share ideas, learn from each other's teaching through observation, and to analyse and critique teaching practices developed through discussions.

3. CS allowed teachers to have the opportunity to observe other teachers' classrooms; this is something that does not normally happen on a regular basis, the opening up of classrooms to colleagues served to lessen feelings of isolation held by teachers.

4. Administrative support had a large effect on the

success of the CS project at Keywest School; especially with regard to teacher release time, and encouragement and recognition of participants.

5. The CS process was one that required considerable time and commitment on the part of teachers and administrators.

6. The size of the school population affected the teachers' abilities to find a "good" teaching partner with whom to build a collegial relationship.

7. Teacher participation in CS allowed them to take risks in a "safe" environment and then implement new ideas and strategies in their own classrooms.

Summary of Potential Responses to the Research Question and Sub-questions

The following section offers some potential answers to the general research question and the sub-questions. The general research question was: Do teachers perceive themselves as willing to take risks and to try innovative teaching strategies when they engage in a CS process? The findings for this study suggest that teachers are willing to take risks when they participate in CS with a trusted teaching partner who can offer support and feedback on their teaching from within a non-threatening environment. Teachers' participation in CS provides them with opportunities to share ideas and to learn from observation. These innovations are, typically, subsequently implemented in teachers' classrooms.

The first sub-question was: Can the CS process help to develop feelings of collegiality amongst teachers? Feelings of collegiality can develop between teachers who work together and who develop a strong supportive relationship based on trust. As rapport is established between teachers, they begin to feel more comfortable with each other and are willing to help each other to grow professionally.

The following is offered in response to the second sub-question: Can the CS process help to reduce feelings of isolation among teachers? Feelings of isolation existed amongst the teachers in this study. Collaborative supervision offered teachers opportunities to work with teaching partners, observing in classrooms and building strong rapport. Collaborative supervision allows teachers to develop strong collegial relationships with their teaching partners by providing someone with whom teachers can discuss concerns and share ideas. This process of sharing ultimately leads to reduced feelings of isolation in teachers.

The third sub-question was: What is the perceived effect of administrative support on the CS process? I believe that without strong administrative support in the form of release time, encouragement, and recognition CS would not be successful. Teachers do not have enough time during the school day to participate in the time consuming process of CS, regardless of its value to them. Only when provisions are made to release teachers from classes during instructional time will teachers feel that they are able to participate in the CS process without simply adding too much work to their already busy schedules.

The fourth sub-question was: What value do teachers perceive that the CS process has for their professional development? Teachers believed that the process of CS has value for them by providing them with opportunities to share ideas and to learn from observation. Working with other teachers on professional growth activities allows them to acquire and implement new knowledge in their own teaching practice.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter is three-fold. First, it provides an overview of the study by describing the: (a) general research question and sub-questions, and (b) the method used. Second, conclusions are drawn based on the findings and the literature reviewed. Third, recommendations for practice and further research are made based on the conclusions.

Nature of the Study

At a practical level, this research looked at the process of CS and whether it could be used by teachers as a vehicle for professional development. The main research question was: "Do teachers perceive themselves as willing to take risks and to try innovative teaching strategies when they engage in CS?" Four sub-questions guided the study, namely:

1. Can the CS process help to develop feelings of collegiality amongst teachers?
2. Can the CS process help to reduce feelings of isolation amongst

teachers?

3. What is the perceived effect of administrative support on the CS process?

4. What value do teachers perceive that the CS process has for their professional development?

Method Used

A CS information session was offered to teachers at Keywest School. Following this session, teachers were invited to participate in the process at the school level; each participant choose a teaching partner and participate in a minimum of two rounds of CS. Eight teachers offered to participate in the study; six teachers from the French Immersion program and two teachers from the English program. Release time for these teachers was provided by myself and by the principal at Keywest school. There was no other involvement by the principal other than to offer support and encouragement to the participants. I was not involved in any of the summative evaluations of teachers involved in the study. Following two rounds of CS, teachers were asked to individually participate in a semi-structured interview with me to discuss their perceptions of the CS process.

The data were analyzed using both inductive and deductive processes. The findings were synthesized and placed in context with the literature, from these findings emerged the eight conclusions addressed in this chapter.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings and the literature reviewed for this study.

1. Teachers can develop collegial relationships with each other through participation in CS. If teachers work together, helping each other and talking about their teaching practice, with a goal of teacher growth in mind, they are acting collegially. As the level of trust and comfort with their teaching partners begins to increase, teachers start to develop a stronger rapport with each other and they begin to question their practice and experiment with new strategies. Initially, teachers involved in the CS process operate at a superficial level where they are very positive towards each other, offering feedback that reflects what their partners are doing well, building their partners self-concepts. This positive reinforcement is very important for teachers who have little opportunity to receive any reassurances about their teaching practices. With continued CS sessions, trust is built, and teachers move to a level that includes more feedback that is not only positive but is critically constructive. Associated with this constructive criticism phase is

the movement by the teacher to a higher level of reflection. At this stage, teachers appear to take greater risks in the selection of foci for their CS. Consequently, teachers must feel secure enough in their relationships with their teaching partners to consider alternative strategies for future teaching practice without feeling defensive or inadequate. It appears to be more difficult to accept constructive criticism from a someone with whom there has been no collaboration or no opportunity to build a trusting, collegial relationship.

2. Collaborative supervision does have value for teachers as a tool for professional development through sharing ideas, learning through observation, and the analysis and critique of teaching practices. Cooperative learning is an effective sharing strategy that teachers use frequently to enable students to learn from one another, CS appears to provide similar learning opportunities to teachers for learning about teaching. Teachers know the value of teaching students through observation, yet rarely is the opportunity taken to model innovative teaching practice to teachers. Learning through observation is a viable way for adults to learn new strategies, and one that the teachers in this study found very rewarding. Often strategies that were modelled in teachers' classrooms were implemented by the teaching partners in their own classrooms. Collaborative supervision enables teachers to learn from each other

in a low risk environment; an environment where teachers are free to attempt different teaching strategies without the threat of evaluation.

3. Collaborative supervision appears to lessen feelings of isolation in teachers, by providing opportunities to observe in each other classrooms. Teachers do feel isolated in classrooms, consequently, they appreciate opportunities to visit other teachers in their classrooms. Intervisitations allow teachers to view not only teaching strategies, but also to view classroom displays and organization. Continued intervisitations allow teachers to feel that they are not alone in the school environment, that there are other teachers with whom they can build a rapport and feel comfortable enough to share thoughts and teaching strategies.

4. Administrative support has a large effect on the success of CS; especially with regards to the provision of release time, providing informational resources, and offering encouragement and recognition to participants. Teachers want to be recognized for their participation in CS, their desire to develop professionally should be valued by the administration, students, and the parent community. Since teachers are at different stages of professional development, they may vary in the amount of informational support (e.g. lists of possible foci for classroom observations) needed to participate in CS. Administrators need to be able to provide adequate informational

resources so teachers feel that they have all the knowledge they need to be successful. If teachers are requesting more information or assistance, these needs must be met. If teachers do not request assistance, but seem to be experiencing difficulty with the process of CS, administrators should offer assistance and support. On the other hand, administrators have to be able to recognize when teachers are able to self direct their professional development and when further suggestions may be viewed as interference in the CS process between two teachers.

5. CS requires considerable time and commitment on the part of teachers, and administrators who provide release time. Not only does the actual process of CS takes considerable time, but teachers must plan their teaching and give thought to the aspect of their teaching that they have asked their teaching partners to observe. In order for feedback to be valuable, the teachers must attempt to teach to the best of their ability, and then consult with their teaching partner regarding their practice. Teachers in this study who were being observed by a teaching partner put a good effort into an observed lesson, because they wanted their teaching partner to respect them as a good teacher. I believe that this would apply to most teachers working with a teaching partner. Administrators must make release time available for teachers to engage in CS. Administrators have to be committed to providing the release time,

and not rescind the offer when administrative demands increase. Teachers will not feel that administrative support is present if release time is constantly revoked or rescheduled. As well, administrators have to be flexible in allowing teachers to reschedule release times as changing classroom events dictate.

6. The size of the school population affects teachers' abilities to find someone with whom they can build a trusting, professional relationship. If a teacher is unable to find a suitable partner within a school, a solution may be to have teachers seek teaching partners in other schools. This organization may require more collaboration between administrators, but the result will be valuable to teachers engaging in CS.

7. Teachers' participation in CS allows teachers to, firstly, take risks in a "safe" environment and, secondly, to implement innovative teaching strategies into their own classrooms. This is desirable because teachers need and want to be responsible for their own professional development. Collaborative supervision gives teachers more autonomy and makes them feel more in control of their own profession. Teachers do not have to rely on experts to tell them what they should and should not do. Increased autonomy allows teachers to feel more empowered, resulting in teachers who are focused towards a goal of being the best teachers possible.

8. Part-time teachers may find the process of CS very time

consuming if they are participating with a teacher who is employed on a full-time basis. Scheduling options may be more limited for part-time teachers.

Recommendations

The findings of this study have repercussions for practice and theory. Recommendations for practice and theory are listed below.

Recommendations for Practice

1. *School districts and administrators should encourage teachers to engage in processes such as CS to: promote collegiality, provide low risk opportunities for professional development, and reduce the isolation that teachers feel in schools.* Senior administration in school districts need to become aware of the potential of CS and to promote the process amongst administrators and teachers. Information sessions should be provided in school districts to allow administrators and teachers opportunities to become aware of the potential of the process. School administrators need to be aware that CS can be very valuable for teachers' professional development and can help to build strong staff rapport within a school.

2. *Administrators should have no involvement in the CS process other than to provide support.* School administrators' primary roles in CS should be to provide: (a) information through introductory sessions, (b) sufficient release time for participating teachers, and

(c) encouragement and support in public forums. As administrators are often responsible for teacher evaluation, they are not usually privy to the same level of trust by the teachers as a colleague would be. Therefore, administrators need to be cognizant of their involvement in the process of CS, insuring that they do not interfere with the trusting relationships that develop between teaching partners. As well, caution should be exercised if administrators choose to involve themselves in a CS relationship with a teacher, understanding that the teacher may require considerable time to completely trust that the administrator is not gathering data that could be used in a later evaluation.

3. *An informational session regarding the purpose and process of CS and CS resource materials should be provided to teachers when they are introduced to the process.* Further assistance (e.g., lists of possible foci for classroom observations) must be made available by the administrators for those teachers who feel that they may need more information or support to be successful in the process of CS.

4. *CS cycles should not be considered independent of each other, but rather as an on-going process where post-observation conferences are also used as pre-observation conferences for the subsequent round of CS.* This alleviates the need for teaching partners to meet for a post-observation conference and then again for a pre-observation conference. It also provides for some continuity from

one CS cycle to the next, allowing teachers to implement changes that were discussed in one post-observation conference in the next observation.

5. *When teachers are released from their classes to participate in CS, they should not have to spend considerable time composing detailed lesson plans for substitute teachers, as this creates more stress for teachers involved in CS.* Those involved (e.g., under optimal conditions, administrators who are familiar with the school context) in providing release time should create their own lesson plans, or "cover" activities that require little planning on the part of the regular teachers. If substitute teachers are required to provide release time, then a bank of possible activities that could be used by the group of teachers engaging in CS should be developed by the administration. Consequently, teachers involved in CS would not have to spend considerable time planning. However, continuity of teaching content should be kept in mind, especially with advanced subject matter.

6. *In order for the CS process to be effective, teachers need to have a large enough population from which they can choose a teaching partner.* If a school population does not provide enough choice, then interschool CS is a good alternative.

7. *Teachers should be encouraged to extend their participation in CS to include other members on staff to create more collegial*

relationships throughout the school. CS could be planned with one teaching partner for a length of time, then teachers could work with other partners. Another alternative could involve the use of triads. A third teaching partner could be invited to join the original dyad members to form a team. This arrangement could provide for other possibilities such as one teacher alternating to provide release time while the other two teachers work together.

8. *Alternate arrangements may have to be made to assist part-time teachers to feel less overwhelmed with the amount of time required to participate in the CS process.* Perhaps providing these teachers with more release time, or by paying these teachers to participate on a morning or an afternoon when they do not normally work would provide them with some incentive to participate in the CS process.

9. *Universities should consider offering courses in CS as a strategy for teacher professional development or even as a process that could be used among student teachers in their teaching practica.* This would provide teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to continue the process when hired on by school districts.

Recommendation for Theory

1. The findings of this study have very limited generalizability. Consequently, this study should be replicated under different conditions to test the assertions made here with a much larger

group of teachers.

2. As well, more research should be done to further investigate the role of observation in CS as a learning tool for teachers.

3. Future studies should also examine the benefits of CS over an extended period of time to determine the effects on staff collegiality and on teacher effectiveness.

Closing Comments

The central idea of this study was to determine if teachers perceived that CS could be used as a vehicle for professional development. I believe that this is possible and even desirable. Collaboration is a viable way for teachers to grow and learn in a low risk environment.

Teachers in this study indicated that they felt more connected to their teaching partners and that the rapport they developed was very positive for them. By participating in CS, the increased rapport could help to develop strong feelings of collegiality within school staffs. Sergiovanni (1992) discussed how schools, if they have to become learning communities themselves, are going to reach their full potential in helping children to learn. Collaborative supervision allows teachers the opportunities to develop their potential, the intent of which is improving student learning.

Collaborative supervision allows teachers to accept responsibility for their own learning, inventing their own solutions to their own concerns, with the help of a trusting colleague. But this can only be realized if teachers are given the time necessary, during the school day, to participate in a consultative process such as CS. The time constraints of teachers are a very real issue, one that needs to be addressed by administrators and school districts. If the true value of CS is understood by all parties involved, then making time available for the process of CS will become a secondary issue, ensuring that everyone participates and benefits from CS becomes the primary issue. Schools will become more collegial environments where learning from colleagues is desired and sought after. Students will, no doubt, benefit from being taught by teachers who engage in processes that stress teacher growth. I believe that there are many benefits to engaging in the process of CS. Furthermore, I believe that the necessary arrangements to allow teachers access to this process in our schools should be made.

References

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (1992). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman Inc.

Bang-Jensen, V. (1986). The view from next door: A look at peer "supervision". Improving Teaching - 1986 ASCD Yearbook, 51-62

Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Charles, J. (1987). A sensible balance in teacher evaluation. High School Journal, 70, 62-68.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

da Costa, J. L. (1993). Teacher collaboration: A study of the teaching-learning relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, U of B.C., Vancouver, Canada.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). Policy and supervision. Supervision in Transition - 1992 ASCD Yearbook, 7-29.

Dillon-Peterson, B. (1986). Trusting teachers to know what's good for them. Improving Teaching - 1986 ASCD Yearbook, 29-35.

Dunn, R. & Griggs, S. (1995). Multiculturalism and learning style (Eric Ed 386 526).

Garman, N. B. (1990). Theories embedded in the events of clinical supervision: A hermeneutical approach. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5 (3): 201-213.

Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J. (1989). Teacher evaluation: Educative alternatives. New York: Farmers Press.

Gitlin, A. & Price, K. (1992). Teacher empowerment and the development of voice. Supervision in Transition 1992 ASCD Yearbook. 61-74.

Glatthorn, A. (1990). Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision. Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: a developmental approach, 2nd edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Glickman, C. D. (1993). Renewing America's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C.D., Gordon, P. & Ross-Gordon, J. (1995). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Needham Heights, Mass. : Allyn & Bacon.

Goldsberry, L. (1984). Status of supervisors and teachers drastically inhibits the development of collegial dialogue, especially if the supervisor is also the evaluator. Reality-really? A response to McFaul & Cooper. Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 10-11.

Goldsberry, L. (1986). Is clinical supervision practical? Learning about teaching through clinical supervision. 59-84

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). Special methods for the supervision of teachers. 2nd ed., New York: Holt.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, R. J. (1993). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Grimmett, P., Rostad, O. P. & Ford, B. (1992). The transformation of supervision. Supervision in transition-1992 ASCD Yearbook, 185-202

Haughey, M., Townsend, D., O'Reilly, R. & Ratsoy, E. (1993). Toward teacher growth: A study of the impact of Alberta's teacher evaluation policy. Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools. New York: Basic Books.

Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation. (1988). The Personnel Evaluation standards. Calif.: Sage Publications

Kauchak, D., Peterson, K. & Driscoll, A. (1985). An interview study of teachers' attitudes towards teacher evaluation practices. Journal of Research and development in Education, 19, 32-37.

Kierstead, J. & Mohlman, P. (1982). A research based in-service model for secondary teachers. Educational Leadership, 40 (1), 16-19

Krajewski, R. J. (1993). The observation cycle: A methodology for coaching and problem solving. In R. H. Anderson and K. J. Snyder Clinical supervision: Coaching for higher performance. Lancaster, Pa. : Technomicy.

Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal, 5* (19), 325-340.

Little, J. (1987). Teachers as colleagues, in V. R. Koehler (ed.) *Educator's handbook: A research perspective.* New York: Longman.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C. K., Arbuckle, M. A. , Murray, L. B., Dubea, C. & Williams, M. K. (1987). *Continuing to learn: A guidebook for teacher development.* Andovers, ME: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement.

McKeachie, W. (1987). Instructional evaluation: current issues and possible improvements. *Journal of Higher Education. 58.* (3), 344-350.

Nolan, J. & Francis, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. *Supervision in transition - 1992 ASCD Yearbook.,* 44-60.

Rymhs, R., Allston, D. & Schulz, L. (1993). Effective teaching does make a difference. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 39.* (2), 191-203.

Sandell, M. & Sullivan, K. (1992). Teacher disillusionment and supervision as a part of professional development. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *38.* (2),133-140.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schonberger, V. (1986). The effective supervision of professional colleagues: Self-direction and professional growth. High School Journal, 69, (4), 243-254.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987). The principalship: A reflective practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement., San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. (1988). Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw Hill.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1993). Supervision: A redefinition (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Smyth, J. (1986). Towards a collaborative, reflective and critical mode of clinical supervision. Learning about teaching through clinical supervision. 59-84

Smyth, J. (1988). A critical perspective for clinical supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 3 (2): 136-156.

Smyth, J. (1991). Instructional supervision and the redefinition of who does it in the schools. Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 7 (1), 90-99.

Stallings, V. (1994). Utilizing mini-training sessions to assist a teacher in the use of a variety of activities to address the learning styles and modalities of students in the second grade class. (Eric Ed 385 357).

Tomlinson, C. (1994). How to differentiate instruction in mixed ability classrooms. (Eric Ed 386 301).

Waite, D. (1995). Rethinking instructional supervision: Notes on its language and culture. London: Falmer Press.

Zumwalt, K. (1986). Working together to improve teaching. Improving teaching: 1986 ASCD Yearbook, 169-185.

Appendix A

Collaborative Supervision Information Session

Agenda

1. Conceptualizing Supervision
    a. Evaluative
    b. Formative

2. Teacher Collaboration
    a. Stages of CS
    b. Data collection methods

3. Questions

Outline

1. Provide definitions of supervision given by various authors.

2. Share the assumptions, purposes and methods of supervising overheads with group.

3. Share Grimmett, Rostad, and Ford's (1992) view of supervision.

One way to work towards what Grimmett, Rostad, and Ford are advocating is through the development of rapport and trust. What is important is not your perception of the rapport and trust but the teaching partner's perception.

Appendix B

Consent to Participate in the Study

Dear Colleague,

As a follow-up to the oral consent you have given me to work with you in my study entitled "Collaborative Supervision as a Vehicle for Professional Development", I am requesting that you acknowledge your consent by signing this form. I have provided two copies so that you may keep one for your own records.

As participants in this study, you will be asked to participate in a minimum of two rounds of collaborative supervision (one round consisting of a pre-conference, observation and a post conference for each teacher) before January 1996. I also ask that you allow me to interview you following each round of teacher collaboration. The length of time used in the collaborative supervision process is up to you and your partner to determine. The length of each interview will vary from 15 to 30 minutes.

You may, at any time, withdraw your consent to participate in this study. I assure you that if you decide to opt out at any time, you need not fear any reprisal. All data collected will be confidential; pseudonyms will be used for participants as well as for the school. You will receive copies of transcripts and you may delete any data that you would prefer that I not use.

Following the conclusion of this study, you will be provided with copies. If you have any questions or concerns, you may contact me or my advisor, Dr. J. daCosta at 492-5868. Thankyou for participating in this study. Your contribution is greatly appreciated.
Sincerely,

L. Ringrose

I,__________, acknowledge that I give my permission to Lorraine Ringrose to include me in the study as described above.

______________________ ______________________

Signature Date

Appendix C

Questions for the Semi-Structured Interviews

1. How did you come to a decision about the focus of your observations?

2. How did you decide who you would work with?

3. How did you feel about the conferencing process at the end of your conference? (Probe)

4. Was there anything in particular that you wanted to try as a result of your conference process?

5. Was there any part of the observation or the conference that you would like to change?

6. Can you think of anything you have learned or gained as a result of collaborating with your partner?

7. Having participated in this process, do you feel that there are any benefits to the process for teachers?

8. Do you feel that administrative support has any bearing on the process whatsoever?

9. Was there anything that you would have wanted administration to do or provide to facilitate you in this process?

10. Was there anything that administration did do or provide that aided you in the process?

11. Would you like to continue with the collaborative supervision in the future?

12. Are there any sorts of changes you would like to see implemented in this sort of program if you were to continue in it?

Appendix D

Sample Interview

I: This is December 22. Lorraine Ringrose meeting with Bill. Bill has just completed two rounds or collaborative supervision with his teaching partner Bob. And Bill has submitted the consent form to me and Bill do you mind if this interview is taped?

A: I don't mind at all.

I: Thank you. I'm just going to ask you a few questions about collaborative supervision. First of all I'm just going to ask you how you came about deciding on your partner that you decided to work with.

A: I believe it was Bob that approached me and we're next door neighbours. And he teaches grade four and I teach grade six and we're very comfortable with one another, so he approached me first and I said sure, I'll do it.

I: And then you decided to start your collaborative supervision sessions. How did you decide on the focus for your sessions? Like what he would observe when he was with you or what you would observe when you were with him?

A: Well I can't speak for Bob but what I did was I looked through the hand out that you provided with us and there were a bunch of different things that were suggested. And when Bob observed me I suggested to him certain things that I'd like him to observe and he noted those. And Bob I believe, I'm sure you got this from him, but he asked me just to do general observations with one or two things in specific. I asked him to do more specific observations like non-verbal discipline techniques. I have them written down, but they're not here. But I gave him specific things and they were come about by looking through the hand out that you gave us.

I: Ok. So you basically decided yourself what you wanted him to look at and it wasn't a collaboration at that point?

A: Yes. It wasn't at that point.

I: And how did you feel about the conferencing process after you've been through the two cycles?

A: I feel it was very constructive and it was also non threatening. No matter how an administrator tries to reassure you, there's still a bit of pressure when you get a vice-principal, a principal to come in and observe you and make suggestions or observations on what they have observed. I felt much more comfortable doing it with a colleague. I was very relaxed and I must say that Bob pointed out some very good things that even as an experienced teacher, you know, wasn't aware of. So I found it very constructive and very relaxing.

I: So it wasn't necessarily all of this positives. He gave you some tips as to things that you could work on as well?

A: Yes. Good point. It wasn't all negatives, it was positive things, right. And I think Bob would tell you the same thing, again, I can't speak for him. But you know reinforce positive things and do little...point out little things that maybe could be done better.

I: Was there anything in particular that you wanted to try as a result of your conference or your observations? Anything that came out of those that you wanted to try differently in your classroom?

A: Not really. The things that Bob mentioned, one of the things that he mentioned that there was a very long oral session and the kids were getting a bit bored and as an experienced teacher I certainly know that you adjust your teaching to the kids sometimes. And I was aware of that but I felt that I still had the kids and it was still a productive lesson. So no, there's not anything specific that I would take out. I must say that observing Bob, there's something that I observed from him that told me and that's just body position. We tend to teach on one side of the blackboard and there's a tendency maybe to forget the kids in those front corners. You always have to be...I don't know the term in english, balai ton regard? You're sweeping, like keeping eye contact with the entire group. And I noticed it with Bob that he tends to favour one side of the room and it's something that I know that I have to watch and he actually mentioned it a little bit myself, but it's something that I'm more aware of.

I: So you're thinking about that more now as you're teaching?

A: Yes. Consciously to keep eye contact with the entire group, to somehow make contact, whether to just tap the desk or make eye contact with those kids in the front corners because it was something like I say that was I noticed with Bob and it's something that I have to watch myself.

I: Was there any part of the observation or the conference that you would change or would like to change as you continue?

A: No I wouldn't. I think it's very constructive that you can do it immediately. Ok, I think if you wait 'til next lunch hour you will loose some of the impact or some of your gut feelings about the lesson. No, we have the conference right immediately after, low pressure, we didn't have to do a bunch of paper work. No, I found it very constructive. I wouldn't change anything with how we did it.

I: Is there anything that you can say that you've learned or gained. You mentioned a few things, but learned or gained from this process?

A: In what context?

I: No, just...you mentioned a few things. You mentioned that now you're scanning more as you're teaching and there's a few things that you picked up. Was there anything else that you'd learned or gained through this process?

A: Well one thing, and having had student teachers the last four years and doing similar types of observations, it kind of makes you realize that you are good. Like you know when I think back to student teachers and I'm sitting there writing pages and pages and there are so many suggestions and you still have to bring out positive things, but I find it reinforcing that..you know that I'm a good competent teacher and I know what I'm doing. I don't know if that's what you're looking for but...

I: All that experience Bill.

A: Yes, it's all the experience, but I find that very positive. But I think the suggestions that are drawn out are very helpful. Another thing Lorraine I think might help is some teachers, and I admit that I was like this early on in my teaching career, kind of clinch up when there's an adult observing. You know whether a parent is there or an administrator, or whomever. Early in my teaching career I was very nervous in that situation. I must say with Bob there I didn't feel the slightest bit nervous, it was very natural and I think that was good practice, just to have somebody in the class observing.

I: Ok. Do you think that having gone through this process, do you think that there are any benefits for teachers in general, doing collaborative supervision?

A: Yes, very much so. I know Edmonton Public Schools used to have a teacher effectiveness program and I guess it was dropped because of budgets and stuff.

I: We have a bit of a different focus I think, with more of a hierarchal type of thing for the most part. It's mostly consultants working with teachers or administrators working with teachers, rather than teachers working with teachers, for the most part.

A: No, I think it's very constructive. If I were to do something like this again I would be very interested in doing it say with Lynn, who's teaching the same level as I am. I think that would be very constructive. It was good with Bob. No, I think it's very good. I think you've got serious competent professionals who are interested in improving and reflecting on what they are doing. Like Bob and I didn't go in a session and talk about hockey, Patrick Roy. Like no, I think it's very constructive, I think that people genuinely want to improve and I think this helps.

I: Let's talk about the administration for a minute, the administration meeting principal and vice-principal. Does that have any bearing on collaborative supervision, the support of the administration?

A: Oh yes, if the administration let's it be known that it's a worthwhile thing and it's something they're trying to promote, I think the staff will buy into it. One other thing that I think is very positive about this thing, it's not an add on for us. Ok, like we're all so busy, I started mine at the end of November. If I'm filling out forms or have to make sub plans it's more work. The way you have administered it, it's something a little different, it's not extra work. Sounding lazy here but...it hasn't been an add on, it hasn't been another worry.

I: We all know what it's like being in the classroom day to day.

A: Yeah, so no, it's...I think the way you have presented it, I think anybody would buy into it and would be a fool not to take advantage of it. I know like Sheila and Neil didn't participate in it and I would tell them, I would say you guys it's a worthwhile you know, it's not extra work, there's no pressure and you learn something about your teaching styles, maybe get something from another teacher in a non-threatening situation.

I: Was there anything that the administration did to facilitate you in this process. You've mentioned the coverage and the sheet that we provided. Was there anything else?

A: Not that I can think of, I'm sorry.

I: No, you've mentioned a couple of them.

A: But just the fact that you've reinforced that it's not an evaluation, it's just observing and we're more into the process of it. So no, just that it was presented in a very positive, reassuring, non-threatening manner. I think that's very positive in the way that administration has presented it.

I: Ok. Was there anything that the administration could have provided for you that they didn't? Anything that you would have wanted more from the administration to help you?

A: Not really. I think the way you've run it has been very well, it's very clear, very well run Lorraine. No, nothing I can suggest.

I: Would you like..well I know we're continuing after, but after this year is through, would you like to continue with the collaborative supervision process?

A: Sure.

I: The following year?

A: Yes.

I: Would you like to maintain it with that partner or would you think more of moving in with a new partner? You had mentioned possibly going with Marie, who also teaches the same grade level as you, would be beneficial as well.

A: Yes, definitely. And that's nothing negative about Bob as a partner. But I think I've heard that the world...well, the best way to share ideas is teachers teaching teachers, I don't know, I've heard that somewhere. You know there's been suggestion like a PD day, that people just sit together and share and stuff. Definitely I would be interested in seeing other partners. I'd be interested in seeing other teaching styles. Definitely, but nothing negative working with Francois. That's not to be taken in the wrong context.

I: Ok, so are there any changes that you would implement if it were to continue? Other than maybe switching partners?

A: Not really. One thing that I would have liked to have done different, and I don't know how Bob felt about this. We did the observations the same day at the same time and we both did pretty much the same lessons. Bob saw two math lessons and I saw two language lessons. But I think basically we could work that out to switch subjects. I think it would be worthwhile to see different subject areas, you know why not see a phys-ed period or an art period or certainly the other base core subjects. That's the only thing I'd seen Lorraine, but Bob and I certainly could have worked it out, but it's nothing to do with the process, just that's the way the cookie crumbled.

I: The way we had set the schedule for coverage.

A: Yes. Right.

I: Ok. Any other comments that you wanted to make?

A: Nope, I think it was a good, very worthwhile exercise and I think it was well administered. I hope I've given you something that will be of help.

I: You have Bill, thank you very much.